

APRIL 1958

VOL 53 / NO 7

**THE
CLASSICAL
JOURNAL**

April 1958

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

vol 53 | no 7

Latin is More than Linguistics: VAN L. JOHNSON 290

THE FORUM 302

Latin in Massachusetts Public Schools, 1954-1955

Part I: High Schools: JOHN H. BROUGHAM 307

Part II: Junior High Schools: BERNARD F. DEVLIN 312

The Culpa of Ovid: WILLIAM H. ALEXANDER 319

WE SEE BY THE PAPERS 326

BOOK REVIEWS 328

EDITORIAL BOARD

editor-in-chief: NORMAN T. PRATT, JR., Indiana University
for the atlantic states: FRANKLIN B. KRAUSS, Pennsylvania State University
for new england: JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS, Trinity College
for the pacific states: W. M. GREEN, University of California
book reviews: FRED W. HOUSEHOLDER, JR., Indiana University
the forum: MRS. MARGARET M. FORBES, University of Minnesota
we see by the papers: GRAVES THOMPSON, Hampden-Sydney College

BUSINESS STAFF

managing editor: D. HERBERT ABEL, Loyola University, Chicago
circulation manager: JOHN N. HOUGH, University of Colorado

PRODUCTION

design consultant: WILLIAM FRIEDMAN, Indiana University
printer: LLOYD HOLLISTER INC., Wilmette, Illinois

The Classical Journal is published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Inc., with the cooperation of the Classical Association of New England, the Classical Association of the Pacific States, and the Classical Association of the Atlantic States. The annual volume consists of eight issues (October through May). Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, Boulder, Colo., with an additional entry at Wilmette, Ill., on September 14, 1953. Entered under Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on October 19, 1952.



Print provided by Ernest Nash from the Fototeca di Architettura e Topografia dell' Italia Antica.

Alba Fucens: Via dei Pilastri.

Latin is More than Linguistics

VAN L. JOHNSON

I HAVE BEEN READING, with unfeigned interest and quiet amusement, three famous articles published in the 1917 volume of the *Atlantic Monthly*: Abraham Flexner's "Education as a Mental Discipline," Charles W. Eliot's "The Case against Compulsory Latin," and Paul Shorey's indignant reply to both, entitled "The Assault on Humanism."¹ All three writers are now deceased and well beyond the trumpet calls of criticism or acclaim, so there can be no charge of spite or adulation in resurrecting their thoughts which represent, after all, a turning-point in American education, for Flexner and Eliot together clinched the argument for progressive education and a free elective system, while Shorey's retort brought about the Classical Investigation and the founding of a classical resistance movement in the American Classical League. It may be profitable, therefore, to review their different attitudes in the perspective of forty years and see how acceptable their notions seem to us today.

Though I hate to admit it—since I disagree wholeheartedly with some of his ideas—Flexner was the best disputant: he argued simply, coherently, and thus persuasively against education as a mere exercise of mental and moral faculties, endorsing what he called "content-education" and stressing the importance of "interest" as opposed to drudgery in the learning process. He assailed in particular what educators call today the transfer value of specific learning: the "training of

general faculties," he maintained, is quite impossible, and therefore the study of words and symbols leads to absolutely nothing else but the study of words and symbols. "Everybody knows," he proclaims, "that the value of Latin is in knowing Latin." Though he attacked nearly all traditional subjects for their stupid presentation, he was most hard on languages and mathematics which were, of course, the "core curriculum" in that far-off era. "Languages are not learned," he complains, "no one expects them to be learned"; they are not taught "for the sake of their meanings," yet "Latin and Greek came into education as real subjects, not as formal subjects; they came into education because they embodied more valuable thoughts than other languages."

I hope there is no unfairness in this brief paraphrase of Flexner's argument, because there is a lot of sound sense in it: as an eloquent indictment of poor teaching, I can readily accept it; as a philosophy of education, however, it is highly debatable. For example, his central position—that subjects are learned just for the sake of learning them, not for ulterior benefits—is not far removed from the stand taken by a great classical scholar, no less a person, in fact, than A. E. Housman who, as far back as 1892 in a now-celebrated *Introductory Lecture* at University College in London, spiked a lot of nonsense or betrayed his profession—opinions vary—by stating baldly that knowledge is good in itself, that

Latin or science or anything else will profit a favored few with some special gift for the subject in question. He thus took issue with two renowned Victorian critics, Matthew Arnold and Herbert Spenser, and their grandiose claims for the Classics and science, respectively.

But President Eliot of Harvard, Flexner's side-kick in the *Atlantic* debate, apparently restive with his colleague's moderation on this point, reverted to Spenser with a lavish encomium on the virtues of science, rightfully mocked by Professor Shorey at the time, and today, after two world wars and other minor fracas, almost incredible if not ludicrous for its pathetic, yet stunning lack of foresight. To the delight of a better instructed posterity and, no doubt, to the anguish of other impulsive prophets, the President of Harvard delivered himself of this staggering and bumptious proposition; quoth he:²

It now appears that science is the knowledge best worth having, not only for its direct effects in promoting the material welfare of mankind, but also for its power to strengthen the moral purposes of mankind, and make possible a secure civilization founded on justice, the sanctity of contracts, and good-will.

Since not even the H-bomb has frightened us into virtue, Mr. Eliot's claim looks slightly more than extravagant; and indeed it was only one broadside in a remarkable jumble of sentiments, some borrowed, some commonplace, and some more singular ones inspired, one fears, by the strong emotions of an ardent Anglophile at a time when England was imperiled. Without much attempt at connections, the following notions, trite or astonishing as the case may be, are assembled in brief compass: Latin is useless for industry; it should be an elective, not a required subject; ancient life and literature may be studied just as well in translation; Latin is useful only for literary people; English literature is better than Latin literature, anyway, and the British

Empire a more fruitful subject for study than the Roman. Well, on the last point, Mr. Eliot should have known better since the nation he so much admired was, at that very moment, wrestling with Caesarism in the shape of Kaiser Wilhelm. But beyond the short view of history, where is one to grapple with this shifting argument?

Professor Shorey, in his erudite reply, was properly confounded by this question: his adversaries, so he intimates, do not fight like gentlemen, and he must be content with this exposure; he could merely assert, in his turn and, I suppose, with less subtlety than he relished, that Latin was good and useful if properly taught. Even so—or perhaps in consequence—his rebuttal would appear to many readers more polished than convincing, nay even monumental proof that Eliot was right and Latin was only for literary people like Paul Shorey.

To sum up, it seems odd that so unfruitful a discussion—and such it was, for it proved absolutely nothing—could generate any real reform in education, yet the effects are still with us. One feels, looking back at this debate, that it was momentous because it involved certain respected educators who came forward just at the critical time to argue the question of freedom and authority in education. This had been threshed out in England several decades earlier, but there was some kind of delayed reaction here at home, perhaps in part because German ideals had great force in American education until the first World War when they were quickly questioned or abandoned in the general hysteria. Moreover, a concurrent relaxation of authority in the home and in the community was bound to invade the schoolhouse. Whether this was good or bad is a moot question still, and certainly one not settled by the grand debate of 1917.

The problem has plagued humanity since the beginning of Western civilization; and there is no likelihood that it will be solved in the near future,

since it involves, to begin with, a consideration of the whole nature of man — his talents, traits, habits, aspirations, and behavior. And where or when, in a free search for truth, shall we reach any agreement about most of these things? Most of us, in fact, are not and never have been consistent in our opinions on these subjects. For instance, it has always struck me as paradoxical that the Greeks with all their celebrated esteem for political and intellectual freedom, were advocates of necessity in the moral sphere all the way from Homer to Plato; while the Romans — who relied on power, burned books, and exiled philosophers — had a genuine belief in free will. Furthermore, it was really in these eccentric areas that both peoples made their most distinctive contributions to Western thought: the Greeks in education, because they were determinists of a kind and felt that human nature could be changed by instruction; the Romans in law because they despaired of restraining human nature in any other way.

The Greek view is certainly a more generous one, since it excuses all vice as ignorance and holds out the hope that people can be improved by proper training; but it seems to be refuted by the common observation that all about us there are educated scoundrels and uneducated saints. We are not so sure as Socrates that virtue is knowledge and can be taught; and this holds for a knowledge of Latin, a knowledge of science, or even a knowledge of ethics. At any rate, our practical belief has been a Roman one, viz., that man is capable of knowing good and doing evil, malice exists and must be punished, virtue is voluntary and should be rewarded: our whole legal and moral code is based on these assumptions.

True, we have in recent years adopted more deterministic attitudes, especially in the social and the psychiatric sciences where heredity and environment are given a large place in the formation of character. Hence the frequent conflict between lawyers and penol-

ogists, and indeed in our own everyday thinking on such matters; and future historians may find us most interesting for this discrepancy in outlook. The cause, of course, is not far to seek: the increasing study of natural and physical sciences, with their close observations of cause and effect and natural law, has affected our view of man as well; and any real convictions are left dangling, so that we analyze human relations in deterministic fashion, yet, all untroubled, glorify freedom at the same time in politics, economics, manners, and education. Then there is the additional irony that, while we become more deterministic in regard to man, the scientists become less so in regard to nature — or so they tell me — discovering that chance is quite as interesting a factor as necessity in ordering the universe. In other words, exactly like the Greeks and Romans, we are not altogether consistent; and perhaps there is no reason why we should be — they did pretty well in their confusion!

Still, we have something to learn, I think, from the educational experiences of antiquity: the Greeks wound up in educational anarchy, the Romans in educational simplicity. At the very height of their creative powers, the Athenians gave up their old education based on Homer and gymnastic, and opened the flood-gates of reform to sophists, scientists, moralists, and rhetoricians with appalling indiscretion. Aristophanes treats the matter with hilarious scorn in his comedy, the *Clouds*; and eventually his fellow-citizens, tracing their political debacles to bad education, made Socrates drink the hemlock to atone for their own sins. Of course, in retrospect, we regard all this agitation as merely a manifestation of the restless energy which made Athens, as Pericles called it, the school of Hellas. Yet there was probably some truth in their judgment on themselves; and it is no accident that Plato, while defending Socrates, ridicules the Sophists and in his *Republic* reverts to authoritarian principles in education, pro-

posing for his guardians a required syllabus in the mathematical sciences, with its object — and this would have pleased the free-thinking Mr. Eliot — the ultimate attainment of complete virtue!

The Romans apparently got their best education in the home and the forum; and Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi, was long and affectionately remembered for the training of her boys, even if they turned out to be political rebels. There was some formal instruction to be had in schools run by foreigners on Greek models, but Vergil expresses his distaste for such schooling, while Horace remembers little more than the floggings he got, and suggests that poets are not made by doing sums. Tacitus too, in his time, comments on the decline of education; but one only marvels that there was anything to decline. Obviously, the Romans never had any great faith in education; and such schooling as was available produced little more than accountants and second-rate lawyers. The great lawyers, like Cicero, got their education in Greece; and even poor boys like Horace, if they were bent on learning, found some way of getting to Athens.

Well, what is the import of all this to us? A person who takes the Greeks and Romans seriously — and some of us still do — will certainly draw the conclusion that what we want in education is neither chaos nor routine, since both elements help to explain the dissolution of those ancient societies which, in other respects, we admire so much. If, in the matter of *paideia* the Greeks were eggheads and the Romans blockheads, we should like to avoid their mistakes, achieving, if we can, a kind of subtlety and system that will not degenerate into riotous disorder on the one hand or simple-minded uniformity on the other. In other words, we need both freedom and authority in education: no doubt the old school went too far in its limitations on curriculum and purposes; its arguments are dead is-

sues and no one, I am sure, seeks to revive them. What plagues us today is, of course, the shortcomings of that early opposition to authority which, it now appears, was more zealous than discerning. The new Messiahs clamored for freedom, but freedom for what? the easy course, the practical course, the good course?

In a society like ours, where universal education is a matter of public policy, it is certainly necessary to put some things within the reach of all, if we want a literate population. It is also wise to ease the burden of learning any particular subject, if we are expected to become competent in the many different things which concern us today. On the other hand, ease is no end in itself, except for lazy people; and we cannot remain an energetic nation or make education worthwhile simply by introducing easy subjects. The attractions of idleness are pretty obvious, of course; and the elective system has certainly given educational demagogues tremendous opportunities for fraud, deceit, and sophistry in the invention of bogus disciplines or the debasement of real ones.

Practicality is also appealing, especially to people like Romans who put action first, and even to Greeks who admire skill, proficiency, and the creation of experts. There is much of the Roman and something of the Greek in most Americans, and we are likely to equate training of the hand with training of the mind. The equation is delusive, however, and people who specialize in vocations are not like those who specialize in professions; and if, in the name of practicality, we segregate these groups in our educational system by premature guidance, we are fostering a class system which is certainly anything but democratic. Furthermore, practice and theory are not so readily distinguished as the advocates of use imagine: if nothing else, developments in the field of atomic energy should explode the illusion. I don't suppose that anyone today would call atomic physics

a useless subject; but back in 1917 that was no doubt the attitude of people like Eliot. There is a moral here about the practicality of other subjects, including Latin; this may sound ridiculous, but let no one underestimate the power of words.

Ease and practicality are understood by bums and Philistines: they have proved effective motivations in promoting one kind of education or the other. Broader conceptions of utility in education scarcely hold the same enchantment, so when it comes to good courses, which may seem difficult or impractical, an advocate is thrown back on force or sweet persuasion. Force must rest upon authority, of course, and authority was routed years ago. Vestiges remain in our requirements for school certificates, diplomas, major "concentrations," and degrees; but they are, at best, weak reminders of another age and feeble guarantees of proper education. Persuasion now is the only instrument permitted. Well, that is democratic enough, and effective too when it appeals to popular emotions, current tastes, or special biases.

Now one of our national traits is a passion for novelty and a scorn of tradition. New cars, new gadgets, new houses, new books, new plays, new thoughts, new clothes — in these our restless energy delights and thrives: everything new is good, everything old is bad. This is good business, perhaps; it is not good education. It is not sound reasoning, for tradition, of course, is inescapable — even the tradition of embracing novelties: St. Paul records the Athenians' habit of gathering for nothing else than to tell and hear of some new thing, and Livy complains that his Roman readers will be bored with his account of Rome's beginnings, in their wish to catch up with the present. This is a natural urge, but it has been much abused in educational discussions to eliminate the competition of old disciplines like Latin and mathematics. For one thing, people who use this argument or yield to it

forget that any subject is always new for beginners, and to some extent every stage of learning introduces novelty; for this very reason, the discovery of truth in any field is progressive and exciting. Certain subjects have, in fact, become traditional because they are rewarding in this way; for this reason too they may outlast ephemeral alternatives, in spite of disabilities imposed upon their practice by promoters of the new learning.

There are some signs already that American educators and the American public are facing up to the question, "What is a good education?" without recourse to that ready, ill-considered answer, "Something new." In a good course, new or old, we are asking what is taught—skills or facts or values? How important are they? Whom do they concern—the citizen, the worker, the consumer, or the individual? If our theorists have not yet found the best answers, they have at least raised the right questions, and from there they may develop theories of human nature which support a decent education. They may discover, as the ancients knew, that man is more than animal—a thinking, speaking, self-directed agent of his own fate, whose judgment, tastes, and character support or wreck what we call civilized existence. *The main purpose of freedom in education will then be clarified perhaps as freedom to be or to become civilized.*

Civilization appears to be the one great end which education may achieve. Civilization, of course, belongs to no one race and no one nation; it comes to certain people before others and more richly to some than to others, but it knows no boundaries, geographical, political, linguistic, or intellectual. Mere nationalism or racism can never contain it; it transcends all limits and in doing so subverts all narrower conceptions of the good for man. Now Latin has been an intruder of this kind, since so many of its roots and elements have been accepted or absorbed into the language of civilized

people all over the Western world, and now, via English, French, and Russian—I suppose—throughout the Orient. This intrusion is welcomed by some and resented by others who fear its effect on native cultures, native habits, and above all native speech. They dislike it most in retrospect when through it they have become conscious of their own character and proud of traits which they believe indigenous. They note the changes wrought by forces from without, and feel that they are losing their identity. They would cast away the instruments of growth, thinking them to be the tools of demolition.

So it is with Latin which has inundated English in four different waves—the Roman occupation of Britain, the Norman Conquest, the Revival of Learning, and currently the Scientific Age. Latin and Latinized forms have engulfed the English language, there is no doubt of that; no one is quite able to measure the flood any more, because new words are added every day, but it is clear that we are talking or hearing, reading or writing Latin half the time, if not more. From the other side, it is equally impressive: way back in 1902 Greenough and Kittredge discovered that at least one out of every four or five Latin words had found its way into English. This proportion has increased notably in the intervening half-century. The entire process has been long and natural; and as words are added, no one seems to object. In retrospect, however, it appears alarming to students of native culture: even so great a linguist as Jespersen would like to argue with history on this point, and make us revert to Anglo-Saxon or Scandinavian forms on the ground that they are natural to Germanic people like ourselves—never reflecting, of course, that nothing could be more unnatural than this archaizing tendency.

These ideas have had some influence on the writers of our time, but they will presently be recognized for the archaizers which they are; and the lit-

erary people of most recent distinction—notably Faulkner—have given it up. The futility of resisting Latin elements is certainly conspicuous in the wording of Jespersen's final judgment on the matter: "While the composite character of the language [Latin]," he says,³ "gives variety and to some extent precision in the style of the greatest masters, on the other hand it encourages an inflated turgidity of style." No ardent Latinist could have done better: apart from conjunctions, prepositions, and articles, he needs eleven classical words against five non-classical ones to make his indictment! And there is nothing unnatural about his expression, except the pleonastic phrase "inflated turgidity" which any good Latinist would shun! True, he might have found Anglo-Saxon synonyms for some of his words; but I suspect that deep down he knew the truth which Simeon Potter, a less biased critic, puts thus:⁴ "There are occasions when it is useful and valuable to have two terms at command with differing nuances, however slight. Our language gains thereby in precision and power."

Against such a view, the archaizers are always quoting neo-classic models like Dr. Samuel Johnson who was certainly an extremist of another kind, practising a lack of moderation quite unclassical. Horace could have told him to reef his swollen sails. A good writer strives for the right word, not the little word, the big word, the Latin word, the Saxon word, and so forth; he is expressing his thoughts, choosing his image, fixing impressions, not demonstrating theories of culture or linguistics. English is enriched and enlarged, not perverted by its Greco-Latin elements which, properly employed, lend vigor, grace, variety, and subtlety to our expression. Without these elements we should be writing and speaking something about as flat and monosyllabic as Chinese. Abstract nouns would certainly be scarce, nouns

would have to do for adjectives (as in "birthday"; most of our adjectives are Greek or Latin), even in syntax an exactness and economy derived from or influenced by Latin models would have to go; the clarity of our relative pronoun and the convenience of our absolute participle would be lost. No one but a crank will backtrack on his language habits for such ridiculous results; our ancestors had better sense; they chose to augment, not to reduce, their linguistic resources.

In addition, this put them in touch with the other civilized nations of Europe, where languages derived from Latin kept Latin elements alive, and by common use gave them an international currency. Thus Latin and Greek, even when they ceased to be spoken or written, were not dead—in fact, are not dead—as a life-giving force in those departments of life where nations or people of different nations wish to understand each other. The language of the arts and sciences is pretty much the same throughout the whole world today, thanks to this historic fact that Latin knew no national boundaries. It is the classical elements in English—not the Anglo-Saxon ones—which have carried it across the seven seas and into distant continents. If English has prevailed over other languages in this respect, it is due to old assimilative habits formed to increase its capacity for civilized expression.

Apart from its intrinsic merits and its universal character, Latin is important for another reason not always clear to scientists: in science, tradition is always outmoded, the new quickly supplants the old and leaves it little more than a matter of historical interest. In the humanities this is not so: the truth is soon arrived at, and the problem is not to improve upon it but to keep it foremost in a living, rich tradition of ideas and ideals which permeate or unify, enliven or exalt the attitudes and outlook of civilized communities and individuals. Latin has

been the vehicle of such traditions in both the Western and the Westernizing world. The force of this tradition is most clear in Europe where certain nations were at one time provinces of the Roman Empire, though some aspects of it have become blurred by strong national instincts which developed in Europe after the fall of Rome. In this respect, we are fortunate, I think: America has no Middle Ages; for us, the classical tradition is unobscured by intervening centuries of national rivalry in Europe. We go straight back to the sources, and without intermediaries discover there those saving thoughts of justice, freedom, truth, and beauty which affect men everywhere. Our mixed population has readily accepted these ideals, confirming the universality and excellence of this tradition. It has come to us through Latin, through Greek, through Greco-Latin elements in other languages, especially English. If Shakespeare had small Latin and less Greek and Lincoln read only the Bible in translation, each read and therefore wrote a kind of English to which authors educated in the Classics had contributed their share. This interesting point about the unity and continuity of our classical tradition was made by T. S. Eliot⁵ in his Presidential Address to the British Classical Association in 1942; and it has special pertinence, I think, against the arguments of those who would reserve Latin for a gifted few or regard as sinful the teaching of Classics in English. A sound tradition is maintained in many ways.

From all this, it must be sufficiently obvious that Latin is not really a foreign language at all. Yet today this is the single greatest mistake about Latin: it is classified with modern foreign languages where it really has no place, and in consequence it assumes an awkward position. It is dubbed at once a dead language since it is not the living tongue of any existent nation. But that is not the point about Latin: its influence is a living force in other

ways. When Latin is ranked with modern languages, this fact is undetected because our whole intention in foreign-language study is to escape from English. You can't escape from English by studying Latin. You aren't trying to. You become more intimate with English; at any rate, that is the purpose of Latin study in the schools. This was clear enough in the old days when Latin occupied a special place in the curriculum, as indeed it should, since it serves a particular purpose—and not the purpose of any modern language. Latin should not be brought into competition with languages like French, Spanish, Italian, German, Russian, or any other language which is still the written or spoken language of some one race or country or language group. These subjects have their own place in the syllabus, but in paideutic function they are not like Latin. Greek is comparable, but too complicated in respect of alphabet, spelling, and inflections to warrant its wide use in education as a substitute for Latin. Hebrew belongs to a different family of languages, shares with Greek the alphabetic difficulties, and in addition reads from right to left. Again, I am not disparaging these languages. Competent linguists and men of letters should know something about them; but we must distinguish between the intrinsic merits of a language and its pedagogical significance.

The fact is that, of all the highly inflected languages, Latin, in spite of its apparent difficulty, is the easiest for English-speaking peoples, because there are so many Latin elements in English. We use a Roman alphabet, Greek and Hebrew words have first received a Latin franchise for their use in English, while many of our most Germanic words are recognizable as cousins of their Latin adjuncts. Latin and Anglo-Saxon are not, of course, unrelated: they represent different branches of the same Indo-European mother tongue; and this in itself gives us some feeling for pronunciation, form, and spelling. Yet the two lan-

guages are not similar in all respects, or one had better study English only—a supposition which accounts for the erroneous theory that English can be taught exclusively by English teachers. In its higher inflection, Latin has preserved the clear outlines of a basic language structure less apparent in the modern Indo-European languages with their relatively weak inflections. Only in the English pronouns is there anything comparable to the Latin case-system, while English verb patterns with their large use of auxiliaries lack the clarity of Latin verbs for demonstrating tense, voice, mood, person and number. These things exist in English, but English spelling no longer reveals them. In Latin there is no confusion; hence the common experience that pupils first really understand grammar and syntax when they study Latin.⁶ There are points about English, of course, where time and usage have wrought such changes in idiom and structure that there is no longer much similarity between Latin and English or even English and Anglo-Saxon; but a consciousness of these peculiarities comes easiest and best by measurement against original practices still obvious in the Latin. In other words, through Latin students acquire an awareness of language which they are unlikely to get in any more convenient or instructive form.

Latin is neither altogether English nor altogether foreign: it is a quasi-English study whose very in-between-ness makes it a distinctive subject with a special function; and for this there is historically and metaphysically no substitute. Language teachers have themselves obscured the issue on this point: the modern-language teachers by imitating techniques and procedures borrowed from the Latin classroom; the Latin teachers by adopting foreign-language methods to teach their own subject. For example, translation is something basic for the Latin teachers, in my opinion, whereas imitation is the best approach in modern languages.

Teachers can no doubt enliven their teaching by taking hints from each other; but in the end, certain techniques are best adapted to certain materials, and their abandonment demolishes the import of a given subject or changes its intent and raises serious questions about its validity or usefulness. This, it seems to me, is the real danger in some experimentation currently endorsed for the teaching of Latin. It is sensational and stimulating; it may produce accessories of value for animating our routine; it may add incentives for mechanically minded youth, and reap additional profits for a machine-producing age; but there is some danger that, in our zeal for accessories, we may lose sight of the fact that they *are* accessories, and may adapt our subject to the tools, not the tools to the subject. This would utterly pervert, it seems to me, and eventually subvert the study of Latin. There is already some evidence, I think, that the machines used and the people who use them are pointing up too much the difference between English and Latin.⁷ This is only natural, since the machines were devised or adapted for foreign-language study; and Latin, as I have tried to indicate, is not a foreign language.

We read Latin to learn it; we do not learn it to read it, or speak it, or write it—unless we are scholars or accomplished amateurs. Even classical scholars, I have found, do not always understand this simple fact about Latin in the schools; yet their whole profession is based on a broader conception of Latin—as it should be, since the vigor of a good tradition depends as much on the education of a responsive public as it does on the production of experts. Latin is a training in exactness, subtlety, discrimination, sensitivity in word and thought—the beginning at least of a process which affects or even formulates the tastes and judgment of a student. He may not read Latin when he has finished his course—in fact he seldom does—but he will

bring to all his reading, thinking, and expression certain attitudes and expectations which Latin has induced.

If this is the general purpose of Latin instruction, how shall we teach it? It would be immoral to suggest that all roads to Rome are equally good, though this is the temptation, since Latin is so basic a study for the thing we now call general education. To begin with, if it is our intention on the lower levels to have our pupils learn Latin, not read Latin, there is no good reason for choosing any particular author except as his work illustrates the principles of Latin study laid down above. There is nothing sacrosanct about the trinity of Caesar, Cicero and Vergil proclaimed by the Committee of Ten in 1894. That proclamation was partially rescinded by the Classical Investigation of 1920;⁸ and as a result, Ovid, Sallust, simplified Livy, or “made” Latin have found their way into our text-books. More recently a Committee of the CAMWS⁹ has proposed that Vergil be taught in the second year, to give more students an opportunity to read a first-rate poet in Latin. These innovations represent a new liberal spirit in the teaching of Latin, and the ideas behind them are often attractive; yet none, it seems to me, has so far emanated from a reconsideration of the relation between Latin and English. Attention has been focussed almost exclusively on the content of the authors read, not on their pedagogical uses. It is better to read a lively author than a dull one; girls, at any rate, prefer romance to warfare; and most boys, I imagine, have little respect for speech-making—in fact, they would rather build bridges over the Rhine. These are important considerations, and their claims should be met in due order. Moreover, any or all of these authors are remunerative in many ways for English-speaking students. But in order to rank them for pedagogical purposes, we should first re-examine English usage and vocabulary and then determine what to read in Latin.

This has not been done, and we are therefore ignorant of which author or authors have the most relevance for Latin as a quasi-English study. I would hazard a guess that Cicero, "Rome's least mortal mind," would fare best in any such measurement, especially if we include his letters and essays; yet he is not read at all by the 80 per cent of our students who drop Latin at the end of the second year. It seems to me that we have been working in a vicious circle to some extent: from the word-lists to the authors, then from the authors back to the word-lists—and all with little reference to the derivative-content of either or to the grammar and syntax of English.

Not only in subject matter but in methodology we must be aware of the need for change and the reasons behind it. We have done better on this score, I think; but I am not yet convinced that all of the changes made or recommended are desirable—nor for the reasons given. For example, one of the biggest changes made as a result of the Classical Investigation was a shift from so-called formal to functional learning. It is doubtless better to learn Latin forms in their use than to memorize fixed rules and paradigms; but surely the recognition of forms already learned depends upon the application of rules and paradigms. I think that we ape the empirical sciences too closely if we rely entirely upon inductive methods. It is one of the differences between the arts and the natural sciences that the former work deductively, the latter do not; and language is an art, not a science. In Latin we may learn to classify forms by the observation of their function, but there comes a time when the process has to be reversed if we are to get from Latin any of the traditional values.

Another thing endorsed by the Classical Investigation was the so-called "direct" as opposed to the "indirect" method in learning Latin. For the most part, this involved an emphasis

on the Latin word-order in construing a Latin sentence, and testing the student's knowledge by "comprehension" rather than translation. This recommendation, it seems to me, overlooks the quasi-English character of Latin study, and either makes no sense at all for the learner, or produces even more monstrous jargon—transverbalizations, word-matching, and "translation English"—than the older method. I do not remember a single student who has come to me, having learned either Latin or English by that process. As long as construing is necessary, it must be done—it seems to me—in the English word-order and "indirectly" (if that is the proper word for it). When the need for construing has passed—and sometimes it takes years—you can read like a Roman, not before. There is a strong impulse to accelerate this process, because construing seems awkward, difficult, puzzling, and laborious; but you don't ease the burden by sloughing it off. Nor do you ease it very much with notes or vocabularies, marginal or terminal, for these increase rather than diminish the amount of printed material which a student feels obliged to master. We have not yet really faced up to the problem of construing Latin in the modern classroom, meeting all the pressures of universal education and congested curriculum. We feel the student's need for taking short-cuts with the time at his disposal; but we cannot honestly recommend interlinear translations or bilingual texts: one is hideous, the other much too vague.

The best solution, to my way of thinking, is for the teacher himself to do the construing; he is best equipped to guide that search for meaning which is the very core of Latin study. This sounds like cheating, because we have always asked the students to do it for themselves; and some will so regard it from force of habit. Yet it can be thoroughly justified, I think: it preserves the most vital learning process

in Latin study; it is a tremendous time-saver for the pupil in respect of notes, dictionaries, and, it may be, "trots"; it puts an end to painful, garbled recitations; it gives the teacher more time and opportunity for exegesis of every kind, grammatical, literary, and historical; it gives the pupil more time for perfecting his own translation, and makes his progress much more rapid; it puts a great premium on his attention and has a magnificent effect on attendance — after all, the classroom is the best place to get the help he needs, and he comes to regard it as a kind of laboratory where he does actually learn, not just perform. He has no excuse for doing poorly, because he has been guided carefully through every lesson. Latin is no longer baffling. It makes sense. Its secrets are unveiled before his eyes, and the revelation, it seems to me, is far more inspiring and instructive than the lost mystery. If a passage makes sense in Latin it can be put into decent English; and the student, no longer bewildered, becomes less antagonistic toward both Latin and English.

We must, of course, keep well in mind the difference between construing and translating; sometimes we fail to distinguish and grow content with one or the other. Construing means digging out the truth, explaining grammar and syntax, suggesting even here and there a comparable English idiom. Translating involves the whole matter of restating and rephrasing the sense in a second language; this is still the student's business, and his ingenuity or lack of it is soon discernible. As he advances, he may be encouraged to help the teacher with construing, or he may do it for himself; in fact, he is more likely to do it for himself if he knows that it is not his initial responsibility and that he will not be disgraced for making mistakes. It gives the pupil a psychological advantage which he can well use in something so complicated as Latin.

The teacher's burden is not appreciably increased, if at all; and his role in the classroom becomes more important and less disagreeable: he is actually leading the way, not just correcting mistakes and coercing the wayward. Latin becomes fairly painless, but no less "difficult" or rewarding for all concerned. Latin remains a diglottic study, as it ought to be; most of our reformers, I think, have lost sight of this fact and got Latin confused, to its disadvantage, with modern foreign languages.

This exegetic method has other advantages: it can be used with any text—and most of our texts are good. It gives the slow pupil the help he needs, and frees the good student for higher achievement. It puts the teacher in the saddle, where he ought to be; reduces irritations, gives him pleasure in his work, brings out his better nature, and puts his best resources into play. It makes Latin far more attractive for all concerned, I think, and creates new possibilities for teaching it better and faster at all levels—including soon, perhaps, the elementary grades.

All of this sounds much more dogmatic and positive than I intend it to be; my convictions are by no means adamant. I mean to offend no honest advocate of any other viewpoint: there are doubtless many good ways of doing a good thing—so much depends on the teacher, his confidence, enthusiasm, skill, intelligence, and learning. Perhaps I am old-fashioned in putting so much stress on the analysis of thought and language-structure; but it still appears to me that this is the most singular and fruitful aspect of Latin study at the elementary level, and certainly germane to the central purpose of all education. To my mind, education is essentially a civilizing process by which we produce better human beings — with no particular assurance that they won't be bad men, bad citizens, bad fathers, etc., but with some confidence that we have increased

their capacity for virtue and excellence at all levels by affecting their judgment, their tastes, their sensitivity, and their articulation as self-reliant, self-commanding, responsible, well-conducted individuals. We can do no more, and we should try to do no less. The old disciplines like Latin have proven their worth in this endeavor. If their methods are out of joint with the times, we can well afford to make changes in pedagogical techniques; but we should be traitors to truth if we deserted our main position — that Latin is an extension and further exploration of our own speech-habits and thought-ways, essential for English-speaking people who wish to understand themselves and one another.

Tufts University

NOTES

¹ Vol. 119, pp. 352-61, 452-64, 793-801; vol. 120, pp. 94-105.

² Vol. 119, p. 355.

³ Otto Jespersen, *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, 9th ed. (New York, 1955) p. 156.

⁴ *Our Language* (Penguin Books, 1951) p. 49.

⁵ *Selected Prose* (Penguin Books, 1953) pp. 223-39.

⁶ Cf. Victor D. Hill et al., *Teaching First-Year Latin* (Ohio Latin Service Committee, 1938) p. 15.

⁷ Cf. Waldo E. Sweet, *The Latin Workshop's Experimental Materials, Book I* (Ann Arbor, 1953).

⁸ The publications of the Classical Investigation are now out of print; for a good summary of its work, see Dorrance S. White, *The Teaching of Latin* (Chicago, 1941) chap. 2.

⁹ See *CJ* 43 (1947) 67-90; 44 (1948) 97-143.

THE LOYOLA SUMMER CLASSICS INSTITUTE

invites you to

Lake Shore Campus, Loyola University, Chicago

June 30 to August 8, 1958

ACQUIRE BACKGROUNDS:

Classical Art and Archaeology. Director: Raymond V. Schoder, S.J., Ph.D. Learn architecture, sculpture, mosaics, painting, jewelry, terra cotta, vases, gems, and coins. Every lecture illustrated by Fr. Schoder's uniquely comprehensive collection of outstanding color slides.

FRESHEN YOUR METHODOLOGY:

Workshop in Secondary School Latin, discussing current Latin classroom problems and teaching techniques. Director: D. Herbert Abel, Ph.D.

IMPROVE YOUR SCHOLARSHIP:

The Jesuit Latin Poets. Professor: Reverend James J. Mertz, S.J.

Roman Comedy. Professor: Leo M. Kaiser, Ph.D.

Livy's First Decade. Professor: D. Herbert Abel, Ph.D.

Registration: June 25-26, 1958.

Classes Begin: June 30, 1958.

For Full Information on all summer courses at Loyola, write to: The Dean of Admissions
Loyola University
820 N. Michigan Avenue
Chicago 11, Illinois

THE FORUM

MARGARET M. FORBES, EDITOR

SPEAKING OF TV

Reports of local Classics programs on educational TV are now reaching us.

From Minnesota:

Norman J. DeWitt, Chairman of the Classics department at the University of Minnesota, is currently being sponsored by KCTA-TV in a series called "Speaking of the Classics." These programs are not classroom lectures, but nevertheless are "being listened to by the largest 'class' you have ever addressed," says the station director.

Professor DeWitt is well known to our readers as a former editor of *The Classical Journal*, 1945-50, and as CAMWS President in 1956-57. He is well known to Mid-West listeners for his lectures on the "Classical Tradition" broadcast by radio in 1953-54. This series of lectures was honored by two top national awards: one from *Variety* for the best show management of the year in a non-commercial program; the other given by the National Institute for Radio and TV in Education. One of the original features of the "Classical Tradition" was a series of dramatic tape recordings produced by the University of Minnesota Radio and TV Guild under Dr. DeWitt's direction. These illustrated many of the key passages in classical literature. They were to some extent an outgrowth of the dramatic tape recordings in the Classics originated by Dr. DeWitt in 1950, and now used extensively in high-school Latin classes throughout the country. Dr. DeWitt is also educational consultant for EMC Recordings Corporation.

The current TV series again makes use of dramatic highlights. The lectures are entitled: *Mottoes and Maxims; The Orator of the Day; The Reluctant Hero; Language Without End; All Gaul; The Meaning of the Mean; Happy Endings; The Second Greatest Book; Figuratively Speaking; The Loveliest Teenager; Objectives and Objections; Poets and Passages.*

From Pennsylvania:

Wilson College presented over WGAL-TV during the fall a "Streamlined Great Books Program" entitled "Man's Search for an

Answer." The *Iliad*, the *Divine Comedy*, and *Don Quixote* were each discussed on two consecutive half-hour programs.

Dr. Cora E. Lutz writes: "The program fell in a College of the Air series given at Lancaster, Pennsylvania. I gave two lectures on Homer. My colleagues and I used a minimum of 'paraphernalia' and stayed pretty close to a straight lecture method. We were all amazed at the cordial response, not just from loyal alumnae, but from a great variety of persons from a very wide area. The comments showed that people *want* television to be a medium for education rather than simply entertainment.

"I believe that classicists should use this medium more extensively in the future."

LATIN AND GREEK OVER TV?

SISTER EMILY JOSEPH

An old tale is often told about an Arab and his camel. One night, in an inquisitive mood, the camel thrust his head inside the flap of the Arab's tent. His owner looked up in mild surprise. The camel, meeting with no resistance, inserted one front leg. Still he was not made to feel unwelcome, so in came the other front leg. The Arab, a bit disconcerted, merely drew back into a corner. Thereupon, the camel quietly but firmly moved in completely. This posed a problem, since the camel filled all available space in the tiny tent. Solution: the Arab moved out.

This tale has, obviously, many implications and applications. Among them is the encouraging thought that the camel's gentle inroads, being free from any suggestion of aggressiveness, did not provoke alarm or resistance, yet they were persistent enough to achieve for him the position he coveted.

After five years of participation (on a modest scale) in educational TV programs, the present writer's position is comparable to the camel's in his first or second stage of advance.

The writer, although head of a Classics department in college, is the co-ordinator of a series of educational TV programs, and through this new medium is utilizing opportunities of introducing the Classics to a wide and varied audience. That she knew

nothing, upon being appointed, about the techniques involved in script-writing, preparation and manipulation of visual materials, pacing the program, anticipating audience interest, etc., meant that all had to be learned from "scratch."

Now, programs must be directed to the anticipated audience. . . . Our eleven A.M. one is aimed at the interests of housewives and mothers. Is there material within the field of the Classics that will attract the interest and attention of busy morning housewives? There's no question about that!

In our series, entitled "Weigh Your Words," the Latin department contributed one program which was devoted to the fascinating stories behind such English words as "tantalize," "atlas," "colossal," "jovial," and the like.

Another series, "What's in the Stars?" provided an ideal opportunity for relating the classical myths associated with the major constellations. These programs were very popular, appealing to people of all ages, men as well as women.

In the fifth and current series, the Latin department is presenting three of the six programs entitled "Keys to Better English." Following programs deal with spelling, grammar, and punctuation, and the importance of word choice. Latin and Greek as keys to better English will be demonstrated.

Admittedly, this is a humble beginning. Yet those directing the educational TV project at Station WRGB, Schenectady, must be convinced that an entire series of twenty or forty programs dealing with the classical languages and literature would be not only educationally profitable, but also appealing. (One hundred and thirty-five educational agencies located in the viewing area are participating in this public service.)

The lesson of the camel is worth pondering. A new ending for the tale might be: "Finally the camel stood completely within the tent, and looking with compassion upon the benighted Arab he said, 'Kind sir, because you did not drive me away in the beginning, I will take you upon my back and carry you to strange and wondrous lands and you shall live happily forever after.'"

College of Saint Rose,
Albany

LOGICAL APPROACH TO VOCABULARY STUDY

FR. ANTHONY J. BECKER

[Excerpts from a talk given at the Ohio Classical Conference in October, 1957.]

There is no panacea for the problem of word study, but instructors should endeavor constantly to be more effective in making Latin students learn and retain the lists of words which the particular textbook utilizes. . . .

Beyond doubt the vocabularies demanded by different texts are as diversified as the systems of teaching employed by the Latin instructors. But even the best teachers will welcome a new avenue of approach toward the mastery of word lists. We . . . are ever in search of a more effective way of making words stick. Perhaps Pliny was emphasizing a "frame of reference" idea and stressing the necessity of using a bit of logic in using and remembering words when he said, *Rem tene; verba sequuntur*. . . . Since . . . the mind cannot concentrate on more than one frame of reference at a time, how much easier to move from one object to another within a specific orbit. Surely this opens up a new angle on word study; it affords new ideas and meanings of words, new relationships and etymologies heretofore unseen and undreamed. It gives words new force, even by a better understanding of the parts of speech affected, and for many beginning students to categorize all words studied according to the eight parts of speech is a high impossible task.

On a few stencils the teacher can work out the entire vocabulary for the year. Use the words as they are treated in the book, and let their position or reference betray their meaning. This can be made a student project, with the assignment of various categories to the students, who will have the satisfaction of doing some logical exercises — using alertness and concentration to classify the different words correctly.

Vocabulary choices and arrangements in most beginning textbooks are usually haphazard and disorganized. . . . There is seldom . . . a community of ideas among the words themselves. Such a plan brings out the relationship between words, making it easier for the student first to learn them, and then to recall them with certitude.

This particular method can be applied to any language study. I have seen it work well both in Latin and in Greek. Once the categories have been established, it is a simple matter to drop the words of any language into these pigeonholes. In this system thought prevails over words, logic over language, and ideas over sounds. . . . The mind is a filing cabinet. A systematized plan of filing these words will surely benefit the memory.

The student gets acquainted with one

word, with all of its relatives, its friends and its neighbors. . . . Once a word has been planted or placed, let it stand. It becomes fixed and all other words related to it fall into their natural position or orbits around it. Some words, of course, may fit under different headings, and the classifier must decide upon what he thinks is the best place. This kind of word study will not put the makers of dictionaries out of business, but students using it will not be so dependent upon their lexicons.

So . . . *ab uno disce multa verba*. Remember words by their families, their cognates, their associates, by their genus and species, by contrast and comparison, by synonym and antonym, by negative and affirmative meaning, by similarity and dissimilarity in sound, by simple and compound forms, by logical . . . relation, by their sameness of frame of reference. . . .

Examples:

I. ETYMOLOGY (Derivatives and Compounds), Nouns: *amo; amicus-inimicus; amica; amicitia-inimicitia*.

II. COMPARISON AND CONTRAST, Nouns: *homo; vir-femina; senex-anus; juvenis-virgo; puer-puella*. Adjectives: *bonus-malus; albus-niger; magnus-parvus, longus-brevis*. Verbs: *scio-nescio, volo-nolo, timeo-terreo*.

III. FRAME OF REFERENCE, Nouns: parts of body. *Corpus: membra, caput, frons, facies (oculus-nares; os-dens)*. Verbs: vocal activities. *Dico, loquor, fateor, narro, nuntio*, etc.

Further inquiries concerning details may be addressed to the writer.

Pontifical College Josephinum,
Worthington, Ohio

LIVELY LATIN

The caption above headed an editorial comment appearing in the *Baltimore Sun* in December: "If anything were needed to prove that interest in the study of Latin is very much alive, proof has certainly been given in our 'Letters to the Editor' columns recently. From professors to high school students, the defenders have leaped into the breach, banners waving, to fight for a language they love or (if love is too strong a word) admire. . . . Reluctantly we must declare this correspondence, for the time being at least, closed. As Horace said, *Grammatici certant et adhuc sub iudice lis est*."

The columnar controversy was touched off by an open letter to the *Sun* from Gairdner B. Moment, a professor of Biology at Goucher College, protesting "the treatment, often the

privileged treatment, given to the study of Latin in many of our schools. What makes it expensive educationally as well as financially, is that it is our best students who are encouraged to invest two, three, or even four years of their most extensive study in Latin. Furthermore, according to the most recent report of the College Entrance Examination Board, instead of languishing, the study of Latin is increasing in our schools at a rate fully as great as or greater than is the study of any of the sciences. What makes it paradoxical is that instead of being the mainstay of the humanities, Latin has become a major impediment by eating up the time and intellectual energy which could otherwise be spent in a more effectively humanizing and wisdom-giving manner.

"The times demand a realistic and, if need be, agonizing reappraisal of the value of the study of Latin. What does it have to offer? In the Seventeenth and Eighteenth centuries it still opened the doors to the universal world of learning. This is no longer true. In the more recent past Latin acted as a useful screen to keep the very stupid and the lazy out of college. Our present batteries of aptitude and achievement tests can now do this rather better. The study of Latin affords training in the use of words and the techniques of thought. . . . So also does the study of German, French, Russian, or of the remarkable intricacies of Hottentot. And for the training of the intellect in rigorous thinking, who would argue that any language whatever can compete with mathematics, either for decisive logical power, or, in its higher reaches, for disciplined and imaginative creativity?

"The study of any foreign language should introduce a student into another culture and thus confer some of the wisdom which comes from perspective, from the achievement of a point of triangulation from which he can take the measure of his present. It is precisely here that Latin is its own worst enemy. . . . Possibly our written English has been improved by the study of Latin. Possibly, but who knows, knows with the firm answer that science can give, that it would not have been improved far more by an equal amount of time invested in the study of German or Russian? . . .

"Certainly our understanding or even our factual information about Roman civilization was not advanced by anything we found in Cicero's windy harangues, Virgil's patriotic imitation of Homer's *Odyssey*, or Caesar's account of his own exploits among the barbarians. To learn something we have

turned not to our Latin, but to men like Gibbon, Bury, Toynbee, and Herodotus — in translation.

"What the times call for is an intensive and dramatic (and it can be both) three-year course in the history and culture of Greece and Rome. Here is the solid core of what the study of Latin once gave, but of which it is now the shell. Today's students want the real meat of learning. I know because I teach them. It is time and more than time we stopped feeding them the husk when the kernel is at hand."

* * *

In an accompanying editorial entitled "Hard to Kill," the editor, after summarizing Dr. Moment's remarks "in taking up the cudgels against the teaching of Latin in this post-sputnik era," asks, "Why, then, does Latin persist?"

"Asked for an explanation, one educator suggests as the best reason that there are still people who want to take Latin. Another educator, while admitting it may be coincidence, notes that among his students those who study the classics are way ahead of the others in terms of fluency and command of language. This he considers vastly important in a nation where so many of our leaders have great difficulty in expressing themselves clearly and where gobble-de-gook is all too prevalent.

"Granting that other more up-to-date subjects can do all that Latin is supposed to do, the fact remains that Latin continues to exert its relentless fascination. If nothing else, at least it can claim an astonishing gift for survival. Could Dr. Moment's letter have been so clearly expressed if he himself were not so obviously schooled in it?"

* * *

Selections from a few replies:

"The qualitative decline in American education has been coincident with the gradual elimination of Latin requirements in high school and for college entrance. This 'coincidence' is interpreted by most serious educators as indicating that the decline of Latin studies has been the cause of the decline of quality in education. There can be no question of the accuracy of this interpretation. . . . The lamentable trend, now long in process, toward the 'capsulization' of education and 'culture' so-called, is apparently being accelerated by those whom the sputniks have panicked into scorn for all learning save that directly and immediately concerned with defense and survival. We must not scrap the traditions and verities proven by time in our haste to overtake the Russians

in the field of space-study. The humanities lie at the bottom of our educational structure as the solid foundation upon which specializations like the sciences are reared. This foundation has been weakened to a great degree during the last 30 years or more by the undermining influence of theoreticians and efficiency experts. Now it appears that the classics are being faced by a new enemy, the scientist. It is, however, beyond belief that there are many scientists who share the feelings of Professor Moment." William T. Avery, University of Maryland (Dec. 10).

* * *

"To think that a learned member of the faculty of a stronghold of liberal arts should inveigh against the study of Latin!

"However, the gentleman should be thanked for bringing out the fact that the number of students electing Latin is increasing. Although colleges do not specifically require Latin for admission, many admission officers of the better colleges have conveyed the impression to students that it is to their advantage to have studied Latin. And the good students enjoy the challenge offered by Latin.

"Certainly it improves their English and trains their minds. It is suggested that the study of Hottentot might do the same. But western civilization has not descended from the Hottentot; ours is the product of Greek and Roman culture, as any Latin student is aware. . . .

"Who can read Cicero's excellent prose without not only gaining a better insight into politics of the first century B.C., but also comparing conditions then with conditions now? Who can read Vergil's magnificent hexameters without absorbing much about the customs, religion, ideas, and history of Greece and Rome? Where did historical critics like Toynbee get their ideas? They went to the sources, the Greek and Roman authors. Should not the young people of today be given the opportunity to do no less? Should they be cheated of their rich heritage?" Mildred K. Sheff, Baltimore.

* * *

"We are flattered that Latin is currently strong enough to merit so scathing an attack. . . . If Latin is to be judged by (scientific) standards, . . . is it scientific . . . to cite reputed values of Latin as being 'possible,' while its weaknesses . . . are tabbed 'certain'? Is this scientific certitude? If so, how does one measure it? . . .

"Neither this writer nor any other realistically-minded teacher of Latin today contends that Latin contains all the answers

to our educational ills . . . but we do assert that it is still an 'effectively humanizing and wisdom-giving' subject, some of whose effects cannot be measured in a completely scientific manner, but must be judged in a personal . . . way," William F. Hill, College of St. Teresa, Minnesota (Dec. 9).

HUMANISM ON TRIAL — A PROTEST FORUM articles receive both praise and censure. An example of the latter reads:

"I regret that I do not understand the true reaction you expect from your readers by publishing a speech given by a 'humanist' Lieut. Colonel in the Nazi army (January, 1958). Are we to feel sorrow that his world of 'cherished hopes and values' is no more to enlighten us or that 'only very few of the ideals that we cherished in normal times persisted'? Surely you do not expect this from readers of *The Classical Journal*. Schall's stoicism reached fruition only after his capture and not when he was in the army bringing 'love' and 'ethical values' (the quoted words are favorites of his) to the world. It was only after his capture that

'the ideals and goals of classical humanism of which we had once been told were forced to the ultimate test' and not, again, while in the Nazi army.

"But then perhaps the speech is published to give your readers a sense of irony. If this is so, I commend you and hope to see more like it in future issues. May I suggest that you publish an equally eloquent speech delivered by a Stalinist-humanist calling upon Soviet youth to prepare themselves spiritually 'to pursue truth, beauty, and nobility' and to instill in them the idea that 'only the feeling of love can create the understanding for all things truly human, reverence for the dignity and the life of our fellowmen, and tolerance, probably the greatest of man's virtues'? I am sure that such a man would deliver a speech with as straight a face as Schall."

* * *

Editor's Note: Contributors are urged to keep their letters as brief as possible. All contributions must be signed, but the name will not be printed, if the writer so requests. The Editor reserves the right to print only such portions as seem pertinent to the discussion.

Indiana University

Summer Session, 1958

Short Course, June 13 - July 3: Latin LS10, The Latin Workshop

Planned especially for teachers of Latin

Provides a choice of study-groups on:

Investigation of Principles of Latin
The Legends of Rome
Technique of Translation
The City Rome through Archaeology
Literary Background of the *Aeneid*

Also: opportunity for learning about audio-visual material and equipment.

Also: special lectures and recreational activities. In addition to this short course carrying three hours of graduate credit, other study will be available in full-length courses (June 13-August 8). These will include the Roman Historians and Vergil.

For additional information, please write to:

Prof. Norman T. Pratt, Jr., Department of Classics
Indiana University, Bloomington.

The Committee on Educational Training and Trends of the American Philological Association recommends these articles to the profession at large and particularly to the appropriate officers and committees of state and regional classical organizations as a model of procedure, subject to local modifications, for the collection of data much needed in our field. Intelligent planning that is concerned generally with the strengthening of the Classics at all levels of education and specifically with the procurement and training of teachers requires the establishment of a machinery for annual state-by-state reporting of such and similar data. SAMUEL D. ATKINS

Latin in Massachusetts Public Schools, 1954-1955

Part I: High Schools

JOHN H. BROUGHAM

ALTHOUGH THIS STUDY was begun earlier than the publication of "Latin in the Public Secondary Schools" by Messrs. Atkins, Heller, and MacKendrick in *CJ* 51 (1956) 269-73, 309-12, and 365-71, we wish to acknowledge our indebtedness to their exposition, on a national scale, of material covered at shorter range in these papers. Wherever possible, our material has been arranged to follow their order of treatment. Specific situations revealed in Massachusetts, however, suggest that a similar analysis by individual states would bring into sharper focus certain aspects of the problem and make clear what appear to be local modifications of the national survey.

These papers grew out of a search for new members of CANE in Massachusetts. The generous co-operation of Mr. John F. McGovern, Supervisor of Secondary Education in the Department of Education of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, made available the biennial reports from all public day high schools filed with the De-

partment for the school year 1954-55. From these all data used in this study have been taken. They are arranged in three tables, Table I (see p. 314) being devoted to matters of enrollment, Table II (p. 315) to courses offered, and Table III (p. 316) to data concerning teachers.

The total enrollment and total numbers taking Latin and the percentages derived from them, as recorded in Table I, are higher than those cited by the Atkins study for the same year. The reason for the discrepancy is probably that the Atkins figures were taken from "Foreign Language Offerings and Enrollments in Public High Schools," *PMLA* 70, no. 4, part 2 (Sept. 1955) 52-56, where the interest in Latin was only incidental to that in French and Spanish. Another possible source of error lies in the dates as of which the MLA figures and those in this paper were compiled. The schools listed in columns 1-11 of Table I are those offering some courses in Latin. In addition there were 18 general high schools with

a total enrollment of 5595 reporting no Latin courses. These have been tabulated in columns 12-13 of Table I. Four more technical or trade schools with a total enrollment of 4782, which of their nature would not be expected to offer Latin, are included at the bottom of Table I and in the totals. If these two groups are added to the total enrollment of the high schools offering Latin, the total for the state is 131,568 pupils. Of the 20,165 pupils taking Latin, 8668 are in Latin I, 8603 in Latin II, and 2894 in Advanced Latin, a category which includes Latin III, Latin IV, and combined or alternate classes of Latin III and Latin IV. This represents 15.3 per cent of the total enrollment for the state, or 16.6 per cent of the total enrollment in schools offering Latin. Junior high schools and grades 7 and 8 of six-year high schools have been omitted from all listings.

Three anomalies in Table I call for comment. The high enrollment in the schools with 700-799 pupils is accounted for by the presence in this group of the Girls Latin School in Boston, all of whose pupils take Latin. Similarly, the Boys Latin School in Boston is responsible for the higher numbers in the 1300-1399 group. The low percentage in the 1900-1999 group is due to the fact that one of the two schools in this group is the Worcester High School of Commerce, where one might expect no Latin to be taught, and the 74 Latin pupils in the enrollment of 1903 are a pleasant surprise, however damaging to averages.

The Atkins study considers statistically significant the percentage of beginners who go on to Advanced Latin. This calculation assumes that the high-school Latin I enrollment in a given year is a valid measure of the number beginning Latin in the previous year or the next, since in some schools Latin I is offered only in alternate years. The number taking Advanced Latin is divided into the number taking Latin I, and the resulting quotient is the measure of the percentage of hold-

over from elementary to advanced Latin. The absurdly high values in column 11 of Table I — up to 558 per cent — obtained in this study by using the calculation described suggest that even though the total percentage is close to that found in the Atkins report, the entire technique is statistically doubtful. This statistical question will be considered again at the end of this paper. There is reason to believe that the figure of 34.4 per cent is an inaccurate measure of the number continuing into Advanced Latin and that the true percentage would be lower and less encouraging, a possibility which is recognized by the authors of the Atkins report.

Table II shows that the size of the high school has a definite bearing on the availability of Latin instruction in the school. The 8 schools offering Latin I and II in alternate years have enrollments below 300. Eighty per cent of the 25 schools offering no Latin I have enrollments below 700. The low figures reported for Latin I in many other schools suggest the likelihood that in their communities Latin I is largely a junior high-school subject. All 8 schools offering no Latin II have enrollments below 300. Eighty per cent of the 138 schools offering neither Latin III nor Latin IV have enrollments below 500. Eighty per cent of the 24 schools offering Latin III only have enrollments below 700. Three of the four schools offering Latin IV only have enrollments below 800. Eighty per cent of the 24 schools offering Latin III and IV combined have enrollments below 1100. Of the 18 schools offering no Latin which are separately tabulated in columns 12-13 of Table I, 80 per cent have enrollments below 500. On the other hand, 80 per cent of the 35 schools able to offer separate courses in both Latin III and Latin IV have enrollments greater than 600. The "two-year pattern" is characteristic of Latin, as the Atkins study reports. This paper suggests that one reason for this pattern is that advanced courses are not available, and further, that they are not

available because of the limited program of the small high school.

Table III presents the information given by principals in the biennial report for 298 of the 326 high-school Latin teachers in the Commonwealth. The data are incomplete in several respects. Some schools with Latin classes report no identifiable Latin teacher. A few teachers teach part-time in each of two or three schools. In the absence of complete information for every teacher on length of service and educational background, Table III has been compiled only from the information actually given. A summary of Table III follows in the main the pattern set by Tables I and II, except in regard to degrees, which are distributed in the pattern reported by the Atkins study. Two hundred and eighty-two are reported as having the bachelor's degree, 155 the master's degree, and 5 the doctor's degree. Because the reports are inconsistent or incomplete, no attempt has been made here to indicate whether the degrees are in arts, science, philosophy, or business administration. The incompleteness of the reports gives rise to the additional suspicion that the numbers reported for the bachelor's and perhaps the master's degrees are too low.

The average teaching experience of Latin teachers in Massachusetts public high schools is 21.2 years. Columns 6-10 of Table III show the distribution by decades. Although Table IV of the Atkins paper is based on ages rather than teaching experience, the two tabulations are comparable, at least as an approximation. The Massachusetts table presents a less urgent situation with regard to the immediate need for replacement than that in the pilot state of the Atkins survey, since only 69 teachers, or 25 per cent of the staff, are within 15 years of retirement, assuming 45 years as the normal full teaching career. Variations in legal retirement age from state to state and even within state suggest caution in the use of these data, however. If other

attritional factors are considered, such as marriage, death, promotion, transfer to other subjects or more remunerative occupations, etc., as the Atkins study suggests, then there may well be cause for pessimism about the future in Massachusetts.

In reporting teaching loads this study has been limited by the inadequacies of the biennial reports. One hundred and sixteen teachers are reported as teaching only Latin, but in some of these cases the biennial report may have failed to list another subject taught. Administrative duties are handled in so many different ways that it was impossible to present them in the uniform fashion requisite for statistical accuracy. In the first place, many of them fall to the common lot of all teachers, and are therefore not a distinctive problem for the Latin teacher alone. Secondly, some schools allot extra free time within the school day to teachers with certain administrative assignments, while other assignments receive no recognition within the program, but must be taken care of whenever the teacher can find the time in addition to a full teaching program. Therefore in this study only actual school subjects taught in combination with Latin have been listed in Table III, while administrative duties have been ignored. One hundred and sixty-one teachers teach Latin and some other subject—most often modern foreign languages (the reports do not distinguish among them), English, or, to a lesser extent, history. Some even teach industrial arts or household arts along with Latin among the random combinations in column 15 of Table III. The total number in columns 12-15 of Table III is greater than 161, but this is due to the fact that some teachers teach two or more subjects in addition to Latin. The significant fact is that more than half of our Latin teachers also teach at least one other subject. This condition again is true chiefly of the smaller schools, 80 per cent of these teachers being in schools with

enrollments below 900. More than half of them are in schools with fewer than 400 pupils. On the other hand, 80 per cent of those who teach Latin alone are in schools with more than 600 pupils.

All three tables enforce the conclusion that low enrollment in Latin classes is chiefly the result of maintaining high schools with small enrollments. Classes with enrollments below 20 to 30 pupils are economically impractical in most public high schools, and in small schools the variety of courses offered must be limited. The rigid programs resulting from these factors are chiefly responsible for the small number of Latin classes as well as the small numbers in Latin classes. This situation in turn creates the necessity for giving the Latin teacher classes in modern languages or English or history to fill out a program. Of course, the situation may be worse than this, from the classical point of view: the language or history teacher may be given the Latin classes to fill out a program.

The solution to these interconnected problems seems obvious, though it may prove politically difficult. The creation of regional high schools with minimum enrollments ideally of 600 pupils to supplant scattered local schools with small enrollments would make possible full teaching programs in Latin and other subjects, a greater variety of subjects in the curriculum, more flexibility in the writing of individual pupils' programs, and a more economical administration in general. Many states, including Massachusetts, have enacted laws giving additional financial assistance to towns which combine to form regional schools; perhaps these laws should be amended to penalize communities which persist in maintaining high schools whose enrollment is below a fixed number of pupils—a number which the evidence of this study suggests should be set somewhere about 600. A concerted effort by classical associations and organizations in other subject fields on behalf of such legislation and the consolidations it would

encourage would seem to be a worthy program from which the public would benefit.

Until the condition just described is corrected, there is a definite need to prepare those who hope to teach Latin for the reality they will face. It is better, from the classical point of view, to have a Latin teacher with a minor in another subject than *vice versa*. College and university departments of Classics should therefore give serious thought to a method of preparing prospective Latin teachers for minor certification in other subjects. The three subjects indicated by Table II as most commonly taught in combination with Latin have some obvious connections with Latin, and it should not be too difficult for Classics departments to arrange with the corresponding college departments to stress these relationships. Holders of the bachelor's and master's degrees might well be graduated, under such an arrangement, with a standard amount of preparation in one of these fields as a major and in another as a minor. The solution of this problem should not be left to chance, and classical associations should exert themselves to have a clear voice in formulating whatever solution may be adopted.

A more difficult problem is presented by the fact that an unascertained number of those now teaching Latin may not have had adequate training in the Classics. It would seem the part of wisdom for the classical associations to take an interest in this question to the extent of developing some plan for supplementing the background of such teachers. Workshops and courses offered by the Classics departments of nearby colleges, carrying credit in the fields of education or Classics, would be attractive to such teachers, but against this must be weighed the fact that attending such classes involves time, money, and travel. Another possibility is the scheduling of frequent meetings of local groups within each classical association, designed to meet the needs

of these teachers and to attract them to attend.

This paper originated in an effort to find members for CANE. The unpleasant fact is that of 298 high-school Latin teachers listed, only 63, or 21 per cent, were members. While it is doubtless true that many of the non-members are primarily teachers of other subjects and belong to other professional organizations in their major subject fields, nevertheless the implication for CANE was quite clear. The existing membership machinery was inadequate for the size of the job facing it. There was no effective solicitation of prospective members in public high schools. Was this true also of junior high schools, parochial schools, private schools, and colleges? Was it true in other New England states? An *ad hoc* committee was given the task of formulating plans for a continuing program for the future. These plans call for the complete listing of teachers of Classics in all schools at all levels; the division of responsibility for membership locally among a greater number of workers, with emphasis on personal solicitation; the formulation of membership benefits more attractive to part-time Latin teachers; and increased emphasis on frequent informal meetings of smaller local groups within CANE. This program, subject to continuing re-evaluation, seems to offer a reasonably practical prospect of making the services of CANE more effective in meeting some of the problems described here.

A final comment is necessary in regard to statistical techniques, based on difficulties encountered in the preparation of these papers. No survey of this sort can be accurate unless the data are reported uniformly. More explicit instructions in the Massachusetts biennial report form might eliminate the variations in filling out the form. All reports for a given year should be required to refer to a single date, no matter when the reports are prepared, no matter for what authority they are compiled. Should the percentage of en-

rollment in Latin be calculated as part of a total enrollment including trade schools and other schools in which pupils have no opportunity to take Latin? Variations in these matters suggest the necessity of standardizing the methods of reporting. Recommendations for drawing up such a standardized procedure should not be formulated without consulting persons familiar with local procedures, specialists in each subject field, and professional statisticians. The standardization should be national and inter-disciplinary, rather than local and limited to one subject. In the particular field covered by these papers, it is suggested that no further use be made of the procedure for calculating the percentage of carry-over into the advanced years of a subject, at least until the objections raised in this study can be evaluated. Columns 5, 6, and 7 of Table III in the Atkins study purport to show this figure for language enrollments in each state, although the authors warn that the picture presented is too optimistic. This calculation is based on the MLA assumption that the data for Latin I are reliable. This would appear not to be true, since no account is taken of junior high-school enrollments in Latin, and no proof is offered for the assumption that the figures for schools offering Latin I and II in alternate years will give a representative total for Latin I in any given year. Furthermore, the MLA figures do not disclose how many pupils in Latin II or Advanced Latin began the subject in private or parochial schools and then transferred to public schools. Only a complete survey of all schools will give the full data. Such a survey would have to be done separately for each state; it would be an onerous chore, but the data are available and could be handled by a group of researchers, in case they are too numerous for one researcher to cope with. Until such a survey is made, papers such as these can offer only approximations.

South Boston High School

Part II: Junior High Schools

BERNARD F. DEVLIN

THE DATA for the junior high schools are from the same source as the data in Part I—the biennial reports filed with the Massachusetts Department of Education by the public junior high schools of the Commonwealth for the year 1954-55. The data are arranged in two tables—Table A (see p. 317) being concerned with pupil enrollment and Table B (p. 318) with the background and experience of teachers.

The tables must not be taken as complete, being based on 174 of the Commonwealth's 197 junior high schools—23 schools having made inadequate reports. Furthermore, it is known that in some communities the same teacher has been listed separately on both the high-school and junior high-school reports.

Table A shows that the percentage of total enrollment taking Latin on the junior-high level is somewhat lower than that shown in the high-school study—13.9 per cent in the junior high against 16.6 per cent in the high schools in schools offering Latin; and 10 per cent against 15.3 per cent of the total enrollment in the state.

Forty per cent of the junior high schools of the Commonwealth do not offer Latin, as compared to only 6 per cent on the high-school level; and, as the high-school report indicates, the size of the school has a definite bearing on the availability of Latin instruction, 65 per cent of the schools not offering Latin having enrollments below 300.

Column 5 of Table A shows 1179 pupils taking Latin II in the junior high school. This is 18 per cent of the total Latin enrollment, but it does not mean that only 18 per cent of those who take Latin I go

on to Latin II. Latin I is taken in grade 9 in most junior high schools, and there is no way of determining from the reports how many of those taking Latin I in a junior high school go on to Latin II in the high school. Those who are taking Latin II in the junior high school are those who were offered Latin I in grades 7 and 8—usually covered in two years.

Table B shows 110 Latin teachers in the junior high schools of the Commonwealth. Of course, the number would be somewhat greater if all the data were available. In addition to this, some schools with Latin classes record no identifiable Latin teacher.

Every Latin teacher reported holds a bachelor's degree. No doctor's degree was reported. The percentage of graduate degrees among Latin teachers in the junior high school is 57 per cent compared to 54 per cent on the high-school level. As in the high-school study, no attempt is made to indicate whether the degrees are in the arts, science, philosophy, or business administration.

The average teaching experience of Latin teachers in Massachusetts junior high schools is 17 years as against the high schools' 21 years. The high-school report presents a slightly less urgent situation in Massachusetts than in the nation as a whole in the matter of the need for replacement, and this study shows that the need for replacement is even less urgent on the junior-high level. The need for replacement may be considered more acute, however, if it is calculated in terms of qualified teachers of Latin, a problem discussed below. Sixty-one per cent of the junior high-school Latin teachers have less than 20 years' service as against 43 per cent in

the high schools; 38 per cent as against 52 per cent in the 20-40-year group. Twelve per cent of junior-high Latin teachers are within 15 years of retirement as compared to 20 per cent in the high schools, assuming 45 years as a full teaching career.

Retirement age is not the only factor to be considered, however. It is suspected, though it cannot be demonstrated, that there is much more rapid attrition among Latin teachers in junior high school for reasons of transfer, promotion, marriage, and so forth.

In the matter of teaching load, the biennial reports are less than adequate. However, fewer teachers in the junior high schools are teaching Latin exclusively than is the case in the high schools—17 per cent as against 40 per cent, an indication that there is an even greater tendency in the junior high to relegate Latin to a minor role. Most Latin teachers in the junior high school teach one, some two, additional subjects. Unlike the high schools, where the second subject is most frequently a

modern foreign language, the second subject in the junior high school is preponderantly English. There is no way to tell from the source used, but with 66 out of 110 Latin teachers having English as their "second" subject, one suspects that Latin is really the "second" subject; and where more than one teacher in the same small school is teaching Latin and English, or Latin and history, with only 75 pupils taking Latin, there are grounds for suspecting that the teaching of Latin has been imposed on many teachers without regard for the adequacy of their preparation in the Classics.

This inadequate preparation, considered together with the fact that only 8 of the 110 teachers of junior high-school Latin are members of CANE, enforces the conclusions of the high-school study that CANE has much to do to help these teachers in their work and to make its own program more attractive to them.

*Rogers Junior High School,
Hyde Park*

Eta Sigma Phi Medals

Eta Sigma Phi Fraternity announces that its medals should now be ordered from the Executive Secretary, Professor H. R. Butts, Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham 4, Alabama.

The following medals are available: no. 1, fourth-year Latin award, silver, 1½ inches in diameter (\$3.75); no. 2, alternate fourth-year award, silver, ¾ inches in diameter (\$1.25); no. 3, second-year Latin award, bronze, ¾ inches in diameter (\$1.25).

Since the medals were first issued in 1928, high-school teachers of Latin have found them appropriate awards for outstanding students, and an incentive to Latin study. They may be purchased by any teacher of Latin, who must certify that the students who are to receive the medals have been of "A" or 90 per cent rank throughout the academic year. The officers of Eta Sigma Phi urge high-school teachers of Latin to award the medals. If you are not familiar with them, Professor Butts will be pleased to furnish additional information. Three weeks should be allowed for orders to be filled.

TABLE II
DISTRIBUTION OF LATIN COURSES BY SCHOOLS

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Size of School	Alternate Lat I & II	No Lat I	No Lat II	No Lat III or IV	Lat III only	Lat IV only	Lat III & IV combined	Lat III & IV separate
Below 100	5		2	16			2	
100 - 199	3	4	4	48	1			
200 - 299		1	2	18	4	1	2	1
300 - 399		4		17	5		2	
400 - 499		2		12	2			2
500 - 599		4		8	3		3	2
600 - 699		5		2	4		1	
700 - 799		1		4	2	2	1	4
800 - 899				7			3	3
900 - 999		1		3	1		3	2
1,000 - 1,099				1	1		3	2
1,100 - 1,199		2						
1,200 - 1,299		1		1		1	2	4
1,300 - 1,399							1	2
1,400 - 1,499								3
1,500 - 1,599								
1,600 - 1,699							1	2
1,700 - 1,799								1
1,800 - 1,899								2
1,900 - 1,999				1				1
2,000 - over								3
Totals	8	25	8	138	24	4	24	35

TABLE III
BACKGROUND, EXPERIENCE, AND TEACHING LOAD OF LATIN TEACHERS

Size of School	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Subjects Taught:				
												Lat. alone	Latin with:			
													Mod. For.	Eng.	Hist.	Others
No. of Latin Teachers	Degrees Held		Years of Teaching Experience							Lat. alone	Mod. For.	Eng.	Hist.	Others		
Bach.	Master	Doctor	0-9	10-19	20-29	30-39	40+									
Below 100	17	12	5	0	5	3	2	0	1	0	6	5	4	2		
100-199	49	40	14	1	9	10	12	5	1	0	26	15	5	4		
200-299	28	27	12	0	9	6	8	3	0	4	13	10	2	2		
300-399	21	21	8	0	3	8	4	4	1	2	8	7	0	6		
400-499	19	19	8	0	6	5	6	0	0	8	3	4	3	1		
500-599	15	14	6	1	3	1	5	3	2	5	4	3	1	2		
600-699	10	10	7	0	1	2	1	4	0	8	1	0	0	0		
700-799	21	21	15	0	4	2	6	9	0	14	6	0	1	0		
800-899	19	19	13	1	3	4	6	4	2	10	4	3	1	1		
900-999	10	10	8	0	0	3	6	1	0	7	1	1	1	0		
1,000-1,099	9	9	8	0	1	2	4	1	1	3	0	3	2	1		
1,100-1,199	9	9	7	0	1	2	4	2	0	6	2	1	0	0		
1,200-1,299	11	11	8	0	0	1	4	4	2	6	1	2	0	2		
1,300-1,399	21	21	19	1	4	4	11	2	0	18	2	1	0	0		
1,400-1,499																
1,500-1,599	4	4	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	4	0	0	0	0		
1,600-1,699	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0		
1,700-1,799	8	8	4	0	3	2	1	2	0	3	2	3	0	0		
1,800-1,899	5	5	1	0	0	2	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0		
1,900-1,999	3	3	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	1	0		
2,000-over	17	17	8	1	2	4	4	4	3	9	1	5	1	1		
Totals	298	282	155	5	54	63	86	54	15	116	80	63	22	22		
Percent					20%	23%	32%	20%	5%							

TABLE A
LATIN ENROLLMENT IN MASSACHUSETTS PUBLIC JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Size of School	No. of Schools Offering Latin	Total Enroll.	Latin I	Latin II	Total Latin	% of Total Enroll. Taking Latin	No. of Schools	Total Enroll.
Below 100	5	388	85	0	85	22	15	888
100 - 199	8	1,240	212	27	239	19	18	2,561
200 - 299	6	1,401	135	25	160	11.5	13	3,334
300 - 399	12	4,451	367	78	445	10	6	2,046
400 - 499	9	4,052	551	72	623	15	8	3,553
500 - 599	18	9,370	998	247	1,245	13	3	1,705
600 - 699	13	8,344	866	157	1,023	12	4	2,579
700 - 799	11	7,537	1,021	224	1,245	16.5	0	0
800 - 899	10	8,457	832	174	1,006	12	1	815
900 - 999	3	2,757	160	0	160	6	0	0
1,000 - 1,099	4	4,229	431	111	542	13	0	0
1,100 - 1,199	2	2,528	249	64	313	14	2	2,302
1,200 - 1,299	3	3,774	648	0	648	17	0	0
Totals	104	58,418	6,555	1,179	7,734	13.9	70	19,783
Columns 8 & 9	70	19,783						
Grand Totals	174	78,201				10		

TABLE B
BACKGROUND, EXPERIENCE, AND TEACHING LOAD OF LATIN TEACHERS

Size of School	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Subjects Taught:					Others						
												Lat. alone	Mod. For.	Eng.	Hist.	Latin with:							
																		40 +	30-39	20-29	10-19	0-9	
																							Degrees Held
	No. of Latin Teachers	Bach.	Master	Doctor	0-9	10-19	20-29	30-39	40 +														
Below 100	5	5	4	0	3	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	0								
100 - 199	8	8	3	0	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	1								
200 - 299	6	6	2	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3								
300 - 399	14	14	6	0	3	0	8	3	0	2	2	2	8	3	3								
400 - 499	10	10	7	0	4	3	3	0	0	1	0	0	5	1	0								
500 - 599	19	19	13	0	4	5	6	3	1	0	1	15	3	0	0								
600 - 699	12	12	6	0	2	4	4	2	0	3	1	6	1	0	0								
700 - 799	10	10	6	0	2	6	2	0	0	3	0	7	1	0	0								
800 - 899	12	12	7	0	4	6	1	1	0	6	0	5	1	0	0								
900 - 999	3	3	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0								
1,000 - 1,099	5	5	4	0	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	1								
1,100 - 1,199	3	3	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0								
1,200 - 1,299	3	3	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	0	0								
Totals	110	110	63	0	34	33	31	11	1	19	5	66	16	9									
Percent					31%	30%	28%	10%	1%														

The Culpa of Ovid

WILLIAM H. ALEXANDER

IT IS WELL KNOWN, and particularly so from that excellent source the pitifully iterative Ovid himself, that his *relegatio* by Augustus in 8 A.D. was based upon two causes of offence: (1) the feelings of Augustus, and very possibly his formulated judgment, in regard to the *Ars Amatoria* (plus the *Remedia*) which had appeared ten years previously; (2) a mysterious *culpa*, which was the immediate cause of the banishment, or perhaps one may say, after looking over the scores of pertinent passages in the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*,¹ that in them may be found the match which touched off into a burning and consuming fire the resentment of the emperor over the earlier poems and the wide circulation they had continuously enjoyed for ten years as best sellers in the field of the risqué. Claims made by Ovid in describing this specific factor are (1) that it was not a crime (*scelus*) but only a fault (*culpa*, *vitium*), admittedly wrong (*peccatum*, *delictum*, *nox*), but not criminally so.² He blundered into it by chance (*fortuna*, *casus*) without criminal intent (*facinus*). He had thereafter been first ashamed (*pudor*) and growingly afraid (*timidus*), and had acted (or failed to act) foolishly (*stultus*) and thoughtlessly (*imprudens*).³

The whole affair has despite its bathos created a very considerable interest in modern times, and in the last fifty years there have been numerous scholarly approaches to the causes and significance of the *relegatio*; these are extensively listed by Schanz-Hosius in

their *History of Roman Literature*. They have also provided a highly compressed statement of all that they think it is possible to deduce from our meager materials.⁴ This no doubt represents all that an extremely cautious appraisal might be inclined to concede. Yet I cannot but feel that Ovid through thousands of lines of ex-Pontine lamentation meant the understanding mind to make something more of it all than just that.

We may now proceed to deal with what Ovid firmly insists was the really damaging charge against him, namely, the *Ars Amatoria*; as he says (*Pont.* 2. 9. 71-75): "Nothing that I am forbidden by law to do, have I done. Yet must I confess a weightier sin [viz. than murder, poisoning, forgery]. To spare your asking what it is, we composed a foolish Art [of Love]; this it is that prevents my hands from being clean."

What was it about the A. A. that made it such a deadly offence? There has appeared very recently (*CJ* 53 [1958] 157-67) an answer to that question in an article by Robert M. Durling, "Ovid as *Praeceptor Amoris*," which has in my opinion, so far as my fairly extensive observation *in re* has gone, put its finger with absolute precision on the deadly nature of Ovid's offence in the A. A., an offence rendered all the deadlier because Ovid had smacked his lips pleasurably over it with such obviousness and with no semblance of regret. I wish to invite a full and careful reading of this thoughtful and deep-searching study; for my own purposes here I

shall presume to present the gist of its material by quotation.

"As was suggested above, much of the amusement of the poem [the A. A.] derives from its parody of the serious didactic poem. . . . The heroic and mythological comparisons, which are usually serious in Propertius, and which, because of the intensity of emotion he conveys, are not felt to be out of keeping with his subject, become in the *Ars* and *Remedia* a principal source of humor precisely because the discrepancy is so great and is given such emphasis" (158).

Ovid shows himself equally facile also in taking either side in the great campaign of love, and thus, quite voluntarily and indeed with unconcealed gusto, appears, without any sign of embarrassment, as thoroughly dishonest as any pupil of the sophists. "The ability to arm both sides in the struggle—or to do away with the struggle itself—all with equal effectiveness (*modo das, modo demis*) is the ability which the sophist chiefly claimed and which the central tradition of ancient rhetoric chiefly sought to develop in the student. . . . In Ovid's *Artes* we have a display of pure technique which as such is disinterested, in the sense that it remains superior to and uncommitted to any of the possible subjects or moral positions it is possible to take toward them" (165). The poet steps forward as the virtuoso (and hence professor extraordinary) of "impudent manipulation," and is utterly destitute of any purpose beyond that of enlisting the reader's absolute acceptance of his glittering tomfoolery; there is not a shred of moral significance in the whole show.

"The defense of his poems against detractors, which forms one of the lengthier digressions of the *Remedia*, is just as outrageous" as any other feature of them. "It begins with the proclamation that he does not care what his critics say in the first place—why should he? . . . The whole then ends with a triumphant taunt, in which Ovid

says he has just begun to write; his detractors have begun too soon, since they will be even more shocked by his next poems. . . . Indeed, he will not stop until he knows writers of elegy will confess they owe as much to him as the epic owes to Virgil" (163).

Now set over against this complete absence of any moral seriousness the professed purpose of Augustus to restore to practice the stern virtues of early Roman life, and you are bound to understand the bitter hatred engendered in Augustus' heart by the flippant *attentat contre les mœurs* represented by the A. A. and the *Remedia*. If a ruler has selected for one main feature of his lifework a rebirth of national morals and is generally regarded (as in the works of Horace and Virgil) as having attained great success in his purposes, and has made that regeneration a leading feature of his whole ideal in government, nothing more shocking to his personal pride and to his conviction of the soundness of his purpose could possibly occur than a catcall from the gallery, however smart it may be made to appear, as in the A. A. and the *Remedia* is very much the case. Augustus could hardly as the professed patron of letters have taken any overt steps against the A. A. on moral grounds when it first appeared; a great deal of very clever writing in every age is, after all, frankly immoral, and yet gets by even in the face of British and American puritanism, for example. But let the salacious author, such as our *praeceptor amoris*, be caught off base in some other particular (like Oscar Wilde, for example); he can readily be dealt a stunning blow on some relatively unimportant charge on the basis of disfavor already created but for the time being passed over in silence.⁵ The *praeceptor amoris* is a joker, but physical love is, after all, the basis of family and domestic morals, and woe to him who pokes fun at it, however clever that fun may be.

Augustus was therefore, we may be sure, on the lookout for some means of

taking vengeance, just waiting, as it were, for the opportunity to strike. What that opportunity was, we are, according to the general run of opinion, denied the privilege of knowing precisely, and it is commonly held that Ovid has successfully, in several thousands of lines of tearful poetry, concealed the character of the second charge in the indictment. The first natural remark to make on this point of view is that if Ovid had sincerely wanted to suppress the nature of the *culpa*, he could hardly have chosen a surer course to guarantee the opposite than to write interminably about it in poems sent back with frequency to Rome where they must have been widely circulated, arousing, as they were passed about, acute interest in the matter and coincidentally a considerable spread of some genuine knowledge about the real facts.

But the next remark we must put in the form of a question, not a statement: did Ovid actually suppress all reference to the character of the *culpa* so effectively that we cannot be tolerably certain of what really happened? Is there nothing reasonably specific on which we can fasten without acting too grossly in the capacity of social scavengers? Personally I think that Ovid would have been, fundamentally, disappointed if he had been as unsuccessful as that, nor do I believe, despite all his lamentations, that he succeeded in keeping away from the facts altogether, clever as he was. We cannot afford to forget that he laid the blame for his unforgivable—at any rate, always unforgiven—*culpa* upon his eyes. This misdemeanor, as Ovid would like to have it called, is chargeable to his eyes; he saw something which he had better not have seen. There are several references to this. I shall select *Cur aliquid vidi? cur noxia lumina feci?* (Tr. 2. 103). This is surely pretty specific, one may justifiably feel, and may then go on to inquire: "But does he ever say *what* he saw?" And we are bound to remember in so doing that whatever it was that

he saw, it must have been something which directly reflected upon the honor of the imperial house; it would be difficult to think of any fact of vision short of that which could be made a ground of action against him with such fearful consequences as actually followed.

Most certainly he does say what he saw, *per exemplum*, to be sure, but that *exemplum* was taken from the field he had cultivated so intensively in the fifteen books of the *Metamorphoses*. In Tr. 2. 105-108, immediately following his double question quoted above, he writes with Ovidian clarity:

Inscius Actaeon vidit sine veste Dianam;
praeda fuit canibus non minus ille suis.
Scilicet in superis etiam fortuna luenda est,
nec veniam laeso numine casus habet.

Notice how this fits in with all Ovid's other claims; what happened to Actaeon was a fault of things seen, on which the worst construction placeable was that of fault (Ovid's *culpa*) or mishap (*casus*). Actaeon by an evil chance saw a goddess and a first-rank goddess at that, Diana, in the nude; he perished miserably by way of penalty; thus a mere *evil chance*, if it related to the *superi* or to a *numen*, merited a disastrous penalty, though no evil design could be imputed to Actaeon. Can any one, on reflection, seriously question that Ovid saw, by an evil piece of luck, a goddess in the nude, a great lady, in all likelihood—in practical certainty, rather—a member of the imperial house (*O dea certe!*), and that the princess was, considering Ovid's political and social ties, the younger Julia? What else can justly be inferred from this passage? Who else upon whom Ovid unexpectedly and disastrously looked, could be rationally viewed as a goddess?

How could such a thing happen? Ovid had always been the poet laureate of the high-placed, swift-moving set in Roman society; he had been associated with the older Julia who had passed on to him all the glamor of her circle and a close acquaintanceship with those habitués of it who had escaped ruin in

Augustus' first purity campaign. Ovid's house in Rome would probably be a pleasant place of rendezvous, since he was a man of means, the sole heir, through his brother's early death, to a more than merely sufficient property. No doubt the "set" had had parties at Ovid's house more than once, but about this particular one there was obviously a special feature. Something was going on of which Ovid had no knowledge, in all likelihood. He and his wife had probably been out of town (well-to-do Romans frequented the Californias and the Hawaiis of that day) and the run of the house had probably been left in charge of some friend acting for him. Ovid's return had been unexpected, and what he walked directly into was, one may feel pretty sure, a great surprise to him. He may have anticipated the probability of a party in progress, but what he actually found going on and whom he actually saw in undress—that was something else again.

We may well believe that this was an awful shock to Ovid, something he had not foreseen. Concerning the correct procedure to follow, he could not himself decide, and hesitated to seek the advice of friends. What they might have advised him to do is very difficult to say, and no doubt Ovid recognized that it would be. Yet something definite he should have undertaken and promptly, but let us not try to think of "definite" and "promptly" as applied to Ovid. But not to act in the matter was to seem to connive; it was to pass from a very unhappy misfortune (*casus*) into a *culpa*; the *culpa* was due to an *error*, mistaken judgment, or rather lack of judgment, of what to do or not to do in the circumstances. In all justice to Ovid too, let us remember that some kind of direct information from him to Augustus was indicated. But in what situation was Ovid, of all men, to make such a communication to Augustus, of all people? The state of affairs was worsened by delay, the result of Ovid's very natural *timor*, which kept him inactive in facing his difficulty. Again in

justice to him let it be said that no one could possibly know how friends would act if Ovid sought their advice after giving them the facts. Under such circumstances friends are likely to prove even unwilling acquaintances, whether in ancient or in modern times. For Ovid's particular case cf. *Tr.* 1. 8; 3. 5. 5-6; 4. 10. 101, *comitum nefas*. Remember too that the institution of slavery upon which Roman society rested made that society under many circumstances a perilous environment indeed, and we have Ovid's specific reference (*Tr.* 4. 10. 101: *famulosque nocentes*).⁶

So presumably what was to begin with a sheer blunder in judgment, namely, the failure to seek advice and perhaps to act on it, passed by inertia on Ovid's part into a very definite *culpa*, presenting the possibility of connivance; was not Ovid a member of the "set"? Moreover, the burden of all this was increased by time; each passing month and year during which he failed to clear himself with Augustus by a statement of what had happened made the situation still more gloomy. Yet, time went on, and passage of time can operate conversely to reduce fear, and to enable a person who has been guilty of an unfortunate contact to come to believe that he is successfully eluding not merely any active suspicion but even the glimmer of it; and, of course, if the younger Julia's conduct had displayed any amelioration during this period, Ovid might have escaped the dark shadow of guilt by association. Yet as she went her ways, so much and perhaps so designedly like her mother's, it would seem to become more and more certain that some day would bring a crash, and that in this crash Ovid would be involved in the testimony of slaves, for example, perhaps under the *peine forte et dure* of the rack, connected him directly with an appalling mischance for which no information had ever been supplied or apology had ever been attempted. An error of judgment relative to an unfortunate rencontre had been

made and, as we have suggested, interest upon it had compounded in the long years during which it had grown to seem easier to say nothing than to speak. One might have been a *stultus* had he made some attempt to clear his skirts, but he was perhaps even more of a fool to say nothing in the hope that everything would come out all right in the end, and thus justify the policy of silence. The fact that Tiberius remained, after his accession to the principate, deaf to all Ovid's reiterated pleas shows clearly, however, that even if Julia II had escaped condemnation and banishment until after Augustus' death, yet his successor would have been just as flinty-hearted towards the poet as the great Augustus himself. This confirms the contention already made that what Ovid saw, the *culpa oculorum*, was an offence against the *superi*, the whole Augustan house, not merely against Augustus.

To return to the manner whereby he revealed the nature of his *error* which culminated in a *peccatum* if not a *scelus*, we are bound to note that it is a revelation in a peculiarly Ovidian manner, and, since he had practically completed the *Metamorphoses* when the doom of *relegatio* was uttered, this is of considerable significance; the *Metamorphoses* was naturally still very much in his thoughts. Thus it may well have been that when he came to the sorry fact of his own mishap through something unluckily espied, there emerged at once in his mind the story of Actaeon who through no fault of his own came upon the huntress goddess enjoying after the morning chase the luxury of a bath *tout nue*. This was through no fault of his; *inscius* is the epithet for Actaeon. His hounds had of themselves taken up the scent of unveiled deity; and Actaeon participated in the *rencontre* only by sight. "Clearly among the gods" (in *superis*) "even ill-fortune" (in prose, "sheer bad luck") "must be atoned for." To my mind this reference to Actaeon, coming directly after *Tr.* 2. 103-104, is specific. Put in

plain prose it runs: "(To the matter of magical punishments and the like I have devoted years.) I have just spoken of the fault of my eyes. This makes me think of the Actaeon of folk-lore story, previously narrated by me; he suffered for such a fault, and it was a fault, no matter of intent but purely of the chance of his range of vision following upon the barking of his dogs in a certain direction. The transfer that was effected was that he became to his dogs forthwith as a beast, and they fell upon him as a beast and tore him to pieces. You cannot transgress the privacy of the gods with impunity."

If any one says that it is perfectly incredible that Ovid should make himself the victim of such a damning comparison and thereby give away the secret which he so laboriously makes a point of concealing all through the wearisome lengths of the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, may I suggest that Ovid does not, except to some one in the secret of the evidence against Julia II and her associates as presented to Augustus before the publishing of the *relegatio*, do any such thing? What he actually does is to say: "When I have to think of a parallel for the punishment that has fallen on me for a visual fault, I am led by my studies for the *Metamorphoses* to think of what happened to Actaeon, not for anything he did, but assuredly for what he saw, namely, the goddess Diana completely nude." It is not at all requisite to believe that Ovid intended to convey to anyone that he was referring through Diana to Julia II, even though he does constantly refer to Augustus as a *numen*, and to the Augustan family as *superi*. Yet in the light of what we are now entitled to conjecture I think it quite reasonable to believe (1) that Ovid was perfectly stupid in his choice of an *exemplum* of an unfortunate sin of vision, or (2) that he took a sneaking delight in putting over a comparison of cases which was just too good through its very aptness.

There remains still to say a word

about the *timor* and finally the *culpa* (sense of guilt) arising out of the unlucky encounter with Julia II under circumstances best left to the imagination. Ovid would be bound to see that he had been the victim of a very unfortunate mischance; as to what he should do about it, that was another question. He had friends, good friends some of them, though fewer than he had thought; should he ask them what was the best course to follow? Against that stood two things at least: (1) Was it wise to enlarge at all the circle of those acquainted with the facts? (2) Was it at all certain that any of them would want to do anything about them anyway in such an uncomfortable situation? I am inclined to think that the modern man would under the circumstances do pretty much what Ovid did, namely, take a chance, viewing it on the whole as not too great a chance, not as great a chance as extending the circle of the informed without being at all sure that their cognizance would conduce to any superior degree of security.

As a matter of fact, it was only very late in the day that Ovid decided to seek the advice of friends; as a matter of fact, the pressure was already on and superior authority was now pretty well advised of unpleasant details. The circumstances are given in *Pont.* 2. 3, addressed to Cotta Maximus, his patron and friend. With him Ovid had a conference when finally the news about the *culpa* began to get some official attention; this conference took place at a summer home of Cotta's on Elba (Aethalian Ilva). Ovid's words about it are these (A. L. Wheeler's version): "Aethalian Ilva last saw us together and received the tears as they fell from our sorrowing cheeks." (This implies that Cotta too thought things were pretty bad; as for Ovid's tears, we may assume that by this time they were on tap.) "Then at your question whether the news was true which the ill-repute of my sin had brought, I wavered" (*even then*, be it noted) "be-

tween dubious confusion and dubious denial, fear telling the tale of my timidity, and like the snow which rainy Auster melts, tears of dismay welled up and coursed along my cheeks." In other words, Ovid presented an aspect of indecision. "I did not confess frankly and my denials of culpability were not positive." In fact then, whatever the *culpa*, Ovid had gone free of punishment for so long that he could not bring himself to admit that whatever was reported to have happened, had happened, but that he had failed to say a word about it to anyone. Nor when he saw what fear working upon an unhappy fact of experience had actually brought about, he was simply overwhelmed. It does not seem to me that by this time any friend of his, however much in good standing with Augustus, could have done much for Ovid; great as might have been the anger produced in the emperor by Ovid through a prompt admission of his mishap with Julia II, it would have been as nothing compared to that which the emperor now felt about Julia and any or all of her associates. What it was that he felt about his grand-daughter and what language he used to give vent to that feeling, can be found by consulting the pages of Suetonius (*Aug.* 65). I would not have given much for Ovid's chances of mercy by then; and I can understand why there never would be any as the facts became known. I say "facts" because the revelation of the unfortunate affair became known, involving probably a great deal more than simply the glimpse of the "goddess." To have gazed, even by chance, upon a female member of the imperial house unclothed, was, however, practically *laesa maiestas*. The severe and unrelenting punishment (again *pace* A. L. Wheeler) is sufficient evidence of that, though apparently you are expected to convince yourself that it actually was not severe. Coming from a recent re-reading of the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, I have no doubts on that point whatever. For Ovid it

was to have life turned into a living death.

*Professor of Classics, Emeritus,
University of California*

NOTES

¹ These passages are sufficiently identified by A. L. Wheeler in the Loeb (1924) edition of the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto* by the footnote to p. xxi of the introduction.

² As Ovid had studied law and had served the state as a minor judicial officer, I think that one may assume without further argument that he felt that if given a chance and not condemned *a priori*, he could have demonstrated this. But there are in every age and under every form of government certain things which are beyond question scandalous in the extreme if not exactly cognizable by formal law, and calculated to kindle to fury the persons who suffer under them. If those persons have vested in them an absolute authority, *tant pis pour les provocateurs!*

³ The folly lay in allowing things to drift on without seeking counsel even from his closest friends, and that to the last minute; even then, on his own admission, he did not come clean (*Pont.* 2. 3., 83-90).

⁴ In *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, part

2, 4th ed. (München, 1935) p. 209: "Ovid wurde also wider Willen Zeuge des ehebrecherischen Verhältnisses der Julia; eine Schuld trat ein, wenn Ovid es nicht hinderte, sondern dazu schwieg, es vielleicht sogar begünstigte, indem er es in seinem Hause geschehen liess. Die Furcht vor Unannehmlichkeiten mag mitbestimmend gewesen sein, und wirklich spricht er neben dem *error*, der ihn zu Falle gebracht habe, auch von dem *timor*."

⁵ Wheeler does not appear to think (Loeb, introd. p. xxiii) Ovid was very severely treated in the penalty imposed upon him. I cannot myself understand how any one can read with any sympathy the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto* and not feel that the poet had been, not merely metaphorically but literally, booted out of the civilized world. At all events, regard being had to the fearful remoteness of Tomis and the persistent pains taken to ensure that he stayed right there permanently, as also to the historical fact of the deep sensibility which has always tied a Mediterranean man to his native area, how can we logically talk of "the comparatively mild conditions of Ovid's relegatio"?

⁶ Cf. Seneca, *Ep.* 47. 5: *deinde eiusdem arrogantiae proverbium iactatur, totidem hostes esse quot servos*. Slaves, of course, of practical necessity, knew pretty much everything that went on, what persons had the right of entry, and for what. This was particularly true of favorite or spoiled slaves (*famuli*).

EMINENTLY SATISFACTORY LATIN TEXTS

LIVING WITH THE ROMANS

First-Year Latin

by IRENE J. CRABB

plus accompanying workbook
plus comprehensive tests

ROME, A WORLD POWER

Second-Year Latin

by IRENE J. CRABB and C. RUSSELL SMALL

plus accompanying workbook
plus comprehensive tests
plus text edition pamphlet (Latin text only)

A COMPLETE AND WONDERFULLY INTERESTING NEW PROGRAM

Lyons and Carnahan, 2500 Prairie Avenue, Chicago 16, Illinois

Pasadena

Atlanta

Dallas

Portland

Wilkes-Barre



We See by the Papers

GRAVES H. THOMPSON, EDITOR

WHEN IN NEW YORK, EAT AS THE ROMANS DID?

Report on an intriguing gastronomic adventure in "The Talk of the Town" department of the December 21 New Yorker:

... Back two thousand years [we went] to the Forum of the Twelve Caesars, which has just opened in the United States Rubber Building, on West Forty-Eighth Street. Mosaics teeming with gladiators, aqueducts, and Roman baths; waiters clad in imperial-purple jackets; portraits of the Twelve by Camillo Procaccini, a sixteenth-century Italian painter.

"Julius Caesar through Domitian . . .," said Mr. Joseph Baum, our host and the director of operations of Restaurant Associates. . . . "Thematically, we're ancient Rome—the golden age of Rome, a time of lusty elegance, with a feeling in great measure like that of New York today, in which the good things of life are presented to the leaders of the world."

He handed us a menu, and we plumped manfully for oysters of Hercules, essence of pomegranate, venison Diana, the Great Forum artichoke, truffles Herculeanum, and a Nubian chocolate roll.

"Ancient Rome!" Mr. Baum said. "Jerome Brody, our president, and I went to Rome, Pompeii, and Herculeanum, and the idea sort of grabbed us by the tail. The society of ancient Rome was very much like ours; it drank the best of Gallic wines, smoked and marinated some of its dishes, cooked game in clay in special ovens, cultivated asparagus, imported oysters from Britain, crayfish from Egypt, and lovebirds from Africa, cooked and served its vegetables whole, and liked food that was basically cosmopolitan. But don't think we're going to be a museum. You can still get a hell of a steak here — sirloin Julius Caesar. We're a club of Roman emperors — enjoying the lusty splendor of that period. It's a shame Rome is under that cloud of 'decline'; it's all the average guy thinks about."

We were joined, in *medias ostreas*, by Mr. Brody and Mr. Philip Miles, vice-president in charge of public relations.

"The project actually had more and more meat as we got into it," Mr. Brody said. "These guys made the calendar. They introduced the first bill of fare. They syn-

thesized other cultures. They had the dough. The money."

"The denarii," said Mr. Miles. "We've studied up on this thing."

"We've copied the Appian Way in our vestibule," Mr. Baum said. "Our linen was homespun in Belgium, our utensils and tableware were made in Milan. We've studied Suetonius and Apicius, and we've been briefed on Roman culture by Dr. Frank E. Brown, professor of classics at Yale, and Dr. Harry Levy, of the Classics Department of Hunter College. Dr. Levy has lectured to our staff. We want to be real. We want to have some depth."

"Oh, man, this has been like taking a cram course!" Mr. Miles said. "We've run through the Public Library. We've talked to Gilbert Highet. Our waiters are pretty well indoctrinated now."

"We're having fun with the menu," Mr. Baum said. "Pheasant in terra cotta. Caesar salad. Fiddler crabs à la Nero—flaming, of course—and . . ."

"Tart Messalina!" Mr. Miles said triumphantly. . . .

Over on page 72 of the same issue of The New Yorker, sure enough, there was an advertisement of The Forum of the Twelve Caesars. The telephone number was given as PLaza VII - III - IV - V - O. Julius might have had a little trouble dialing that last one.

SPOKEN LATIN

A late-December issue of the Washington Post (clipping from Thom F. Hanes, Hampden-Sydney senior) reported an interview with Goodwin B. Beach, well known in classical circles:

Seventeen years ago, Goodwin B. Beach chucked a prosperous stock brokerage business and became a Latin teacher. He hasn't regretted it for a minute.

"I got sick of business and chose the academic life. It's always been the nearest thing to my heart," Beach explained yesterday. . . .

A tall, husky man with a ruddy face, Beach is considered one of the most fluent speakers of Latin in the world. He brusquely rejected the idea that Latin is a dead language.

"It has been taught as a dead language—as a mental and ocular exercise. It ought to be lingual and aural. Even today it serves in Europe as a living language. I traveled through Europe a year and a half ago speaking nothing but Latin. It served beautifully," Beach said.

Beach, who is a Latin instructor at Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., believes in teaching colloquial Latin phrases used in everyday life.

"It's no harder than German and far easier than Polish, which has a far more difficult vocabulary and even more cases than Latin," Beach said.

He described the goal of present-day Latin teachers as "unutterably vague." "They say it's good for your English, but they don't give it to them in a stiff enough dose to be good for their English. Anyway, it doesn't do them any harm," he added.

Beach maintained that those who complain about Latin "have had no experience in its usefulness." A year ago, he attended the Congress for Living Latin in Avignon, France, and conversed easily in Latin with delegates from 23 countries.

When it was suggested from this experience that Latin be used instead of Esperanto as a universal language, Beach snorted and said: "Esperanto is not a language. It's a jargon. It could be used for commerce, but whoever heard of literature in jargon?"

When he himself was in commerce, Beach found his fluent Latin useful in one instance.

"I had one customer who came in and discussed all his investments in Latin. He was quite a nut on it," Beach recalled.

Beach, who is on the board of directors of the American Philological Association, indulges himself in some Latin at the annual meetings of the group. He gives the auditor's report in Latin verse.

...

The usefulness of Latin as a conversational medium was confirmed by an item in Meyer Berger's column "About New York" in the New York Times of December 21 (clipping from Colonel S. G. Brady of Asheville, N.C.). The conversation is reproduced as it appeared in the paper.

When International House was opened to forty Hungarian refugees through the good offices of the Ford Foundation the other day, Miss Alcine Guilfoyle of Quitman, Ga., was at the reception desk. She is a student at Teachers College working for an English instructor's license, and lives in the House.

A scholarly looking refugee came to her with a meal pass—a disk—in his fingers.

It was plain that he wondered what it was, but he knew no English and Miss Guilfoyle knew no German or Hungarian. She tried Latin: "Lege vostra nama in ista ligna. Cum volistis edere monstrate hoc. Comprehendistne?"

The man's face brightened. "Bene," he said, "bene." She had told him, "Sign your name on this line. When you want to eat, show this." His happy answer was, "Good! Good!" Worked out nicely, all around.

GREEK VASE AS ATHLETIC TROPHY

An ancient custom was revived when Stan Musial, St. Louis baseball star, was selected as "Sportsman of the Year" and came to New York last January to receive the award. A news picture from the January 11 Asheville (N.C.) Citizen (thanks to Col. Brady) shows Mr. Musial with his handsome trophy and his handsome wife, with this explanation:

Stan Musial, St. Louis Cardinal great, holds a Grecian vase as his wife, Lillian, holds him. The vase was presented to Musial after he was named "Sportsman of the Year" for 1957 by *Sports Illustrated*. The trophy, replica of a vase dating back to 510 B.C., has a sports motif depicting discus and javelin throwers and a sprinter and trainer.

MISCELLANY

Miss Rita Fleischer of Flushing, N.Y., enclosing an article from the January 13 Time points out that Egnatius, the Spaniard whom Catullus mocked in poems 37 and 39, knew what he was doing. The pertinent part of the article:

... In the *Journal of the American Dental Association*, [Biochemist James H.] Shaw reports his findings [on tooth decay and how to forestall it]:

... Penicillin and chlortetracycline (Aureomycin) are effective anti-decay agents, as are urea and dibasic ammonium carbonate. ...

...

Associated Press dispatch from Athens, January 11:

The holy synod ruling the Greek Orthodox Church has instructed priests throughout the realm to christen children only with names of saints included in the Orthodox calendar. That lets out such old favorites as Aristotle, Homer, Plato, Socrates, and Ulysses.

BOOK REVIEWS

FRED W. HOUSEHOLDER, JR., EDITOR

Poetry and Prose. A Selection from the Less Familiar Latin Writers. Edited by BARBARA J. HODGE and F. KINCHIN SMITH. (The Roman World Series) London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1956. Pp. 151. 10s. 6d.

KEEPING IN MIND the overall purpose of this Series—"the understanding and appreciation of Latin literature"—the editors have in this libellus gathered selections of prose and verse which extend in date from Lucretius to Erasmus. But Miss Hodge and Mr. Smith have done more than merely compile a brief anthology. For by judicious selection and careful comment they have succeeded in conveying the feelings of the times to which each author belongs.

The writers, who appear in chronological order, include, among others: Lucretius (201 lines), Nepos (69), Horace (*Odes* and one *Epode*, 188), the Younger Seneca (182), Martial (40), Aulus Gellius (130), and Claudian (29). In addition, there is a short collection of Medieval Latin prose and poetry, covering approximately fifteen pages.

Each author is introduced by a short, carefully written biography which includes a brief description of his work, while the individual selections, where necessary, are prefaced by a few lines of explanation. The Latin passages are interesting, as a rule, brief—both prose and verse averaging about twenty lines—and complete in themselves. Also, the notes on these selections are at a minimum since they "are not intended to provide the kind of grammatical information which can easily be found in the standard grammar books" (Intro., p. 8).

Immediately following the text there is an Appendix on Metre. Here, I am afraid, the principles of Latin scansion, because of excessive condensation, are so presented as to be confusing to the beginner. The Summary of Metres, however, will be useful for quick reference since many of the more common schemes are included.

The remaining pages of this little book contain a vocabulary list which is more than adequate. There is one typographical error: *Hipanus* (p. 120, col. 2) should be corrected to *Hispanus*. Also, for the sake of consistency, the declension number and gender of *amor*

(p. 103, col. 2) and the conjugation numbers of *conscisco* (p. 110, col. 1) and *diffugio* (p. 114, col. 1) should be added. These, however, are minor omissions and do not in any way detract from the usefulness of this interesting collection which should appeal not only to the student, but also to anyone who has more than a passing acquaintance with Latin.

EDWIN S. RAMAGE

Indiana University

Oedipus at Thebes. By BERNARD KNOX. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957. Pp. viii, 280. \$5.00.

THE BASIC THESIS of Knox's *Oedipus at Thebes* is that Oedipus in Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* symbolizes Athens herself. Demonstration of this thesis rests mainly on three considerations, which are amply and ably analyzed. First, the characteristic behavior of Oedipus corresponds in detail with that of the Athenian *pólis* as delineated in the writers of the period, especially Thucydides; both display, for example, swift and courageous action based on critical and intelligent deliberation, self-confident versatility and adaptability, suspicious but controllable irascibility. Second, Oedipus' power as King of Thebes, like that of Athens over her allies, is anomalous, a power attained by prompt response to circumstances rather than through any regularly recognized political procedure, and characterized by a blend of autocratic and democratic elements. Third, the atmosphere of the play reflects the intellectual and spiritual turmoil of contemporary Athens, contentious, intriguing, litigious, skeptical, doubtful of traditional values, questioning for positivist, anthropocentric truth. Thus Oedipus *túrannos* is the *pólis túrannos*, Athens.

As a corollary to the above outlined thesis, Knox suggests that Oedipus may be taken as "a figure symbolic of Western man," even "Western man in the twentieth century," since the essential elements of the human situation are the same now as they were in Sophocles' day. He concludes: "Oedipus is a paradigm of all mankind, and of the city which is man's greatest

creation. His resurgence in the last scene of the play is a prophetic vision of a defeated Athens which will rise to a greatness beyond anything she had attained in victory, a vision of man, superior to the tragic reversal of his action and the terrible success of his search for truth, reasserting his greatness, not this time in defiance of the powers which shape human life but in harmony with those powers. . . . the proud tragic view of Sophocles sees in the fragility and inevitable defeat of human greatness the possibility of a purely human heroism to which the gods can never attain, for the condition of their existence is everlasting victory."

The argument throughout is to a high degree objective and convincing. Reflection, however, suggests a shift of emphasis. Knox himself, on his own admission, does not insist that Sophocles consciously intended creating such a symbol, and one feels that its applicability is no more due to Sophoclean insight and foresight than to Knoxian analysis and hindsight, influenced by a definitely conscious awareness of the tragic fall of Athens and the ironic developments of twentieth-century science. To the present, perhaps prosaic, reviewer, Knox has beautifully demonstrated that the play is an astonishingly complete and accurate reflection of man as Sophocles knew him, but the symbolic meaning of the play, rather than having the same significance for us today, as Knox implies, may be given an even deeper and wider applicability in the light of subsequent history.

The methods of demonstration used in the book are, for the most part, the familiar ones, careful re-examination of the data of the play, further exploration of the ancient evidence, and due consideration of former interpretations. One technique of method, however, calls for special notice, namely, the minute analysis of the connotations of certain categories of vocabulary. Knox uses this device in somewhat the same way as Goheen in his *The Imagery of Sophocles' Antigone*. Thus, for example, he shows that Oedipus' search for the murderer of Laius not only parallels Athenian court procedure but also is expressed to a large extent in the legal vocabulary of the Attic orators, and that the skepticism revealed in the play is couched in terms frequently used by the protagonists of the contemporary enlightenment, especially the sophists and the medical writers. This kind of evidence proves to be by no means dull reading, and even the Greekless reader should be able to follow it with the aid of the translations given for all the key words and

phrases. Knox is much more aware than Goheen of the limitations and pitfalls of this method; objective as it appears to be, it suffers from the fact that the perception of connotation is a highly subjective process and it is quite impossible to determine to what extent a word retains its specifically technical connotation in a context in which this connotation depends upon analogy rather than identity of situation.

Knox pays but scant attention to Aristotle's *Poetics*. He makes considerable use of the word *peripeteia*, even to the extent of speaking of the *peripeteia* of words from active to passive; for example, Oedipus at the beginning of the play is the discoverer (*he-uriskon*, active) but becomes in the end the thing discovered (*heuriskomai*, passive). But Knox has nothing to say about pity, fear, and catharsis, and those who are still enamored of the much debated concept of *hamartia* will be chagrined to read a very convincing argument which concludes that "though the hero's character is causal, its operation in the plot does not fit the Aristotelian formula. For the actions of Oedipus which produce the catastrophe . . . involve not any one trait of character which might be designated a *hamartia* but the character of Oedipus as a whole."

Those who like to regard Sophocles as trying to "justify the ways of God to man" will find relatively little to the purpose. Knox does say that "the play is a terrifying affirmation of the truth of prophecy . . . a reassertion of the religious view of a divinely ordered universe," and that "man measures himself and the result is not that man is the measure of all things." But he points out that this kind of theme is "more apt for tract than tragedy" and that a dramatist "must avoid creating the impression that his tragic hero is a puppet manipulated by the strings of the author's intention or the god's purpose to point a moral." The material Knox presents could be used by extension and implication to spell out a clear and definite propaganda message, but he, like Sophocles, avoids reducing the Oedipus to anything remotely akin to the Advertising Council's unctuous "Give Them a Faith to Live by."

As for Freud, Knox professes "considerable respect for his views," and insists that in his famous discussion of Oedipus (*Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud* [New York, 1938] pp. 307 ff.) Freud is concerned not so much with the interpretation of the play *Oedipus Rex* as with the psychological implications of "the basic mythic material," of which the play itself is, to quote Freud,

"a secondary elaboration." On the other hand, Knox quietly scorns those Freudians who, like Wormhoudt, attempt to make their particular brand of depth psychology the basis for "the scientific study of literature."

In the opinion of the reviewer all this is to the good. Knox persists in regarding literary criticism as an independent, growing discipline. It is not to be enslaved to Aristotle or any other literary "authority," nor is it to subserve traditional moral or religious views, nor yet is it to follow what may be called the current Freudian heresy. It is rather to be historical and analytical, developing its own methods and techniques of discerning the data and interpreting them with reference to time and place.

Oedipus at Thebes is proof that this method is not necessarily dull. The five chapters of the book are so skillfully arranged that, like the play itself "en cinq actes divers," it creates an increasing suspense, the expectations of which are well satisfied in the end. This review has been deliberately restricted in certain respects in the hope that it may not rob future readers of this satisfaction by too elaborate a statement of the total synthesis.

The book itself is well made and conveniently arranged both for casual reading and for reference. The notes, given in a separate section after the text, provide further details in support of the argument and references to the contexts of ancient and modern works cited in the text. Except for a few standard works, the Selective Bibliography consists mainly of significant or provocative works published since 1925. The index should prove very useful for a variety of purposes; it includes not only proper names, but also Greek words (in transliteration) discussed in the text, as well as subject-matter items such as chance and fate, which are of importance not only for Sophocles but also for the general interpretation of fifth-century thought and feeling. There are few misprints.

THOMAS CUTT

Wayne State University

The Greek Mind. By WALTER R. AGARD.
(Anvil Books, No. 17.) Princeton, N.J.:
Van Nostrand, 1957. Paperbound. Pp.
190. \$1.25; in Canada, \$1.35.

"GREEK STUDIES," writes Sir Richard Liv-
ingstone in a recent article, "are a training
of the eye of the mind to see rightly, and
that is a sufficient reason for regarding

them as a good training for life."¹ The publication of a work such as Professor Agard's *The Greek Mind*, then, is a valuable medium through which Greek studies can enjoy a greater and more popular availability among the general public for whom this book is mainly intended. To be sure, the wider diffusion of the humanism that is inherent in Greek civilization and culture must not be restricted to the specialists alone; or even to scientists, who, of late, as Professor Agard pointed out some time ago in a brilliant and lucid essay, "The Holy Curiosity of Inquiry," have realized that humanistic studies answer the "desperate need of developing social ethics to keep pace with our atomic physics."² That the general reader today, more than in the past, has real need for proper understanding of the Greek mind and thought is indeed undeniable. Any contribution in this direction that is both concise and easily comprehensible, therefore, is a praiseworthy one, for the wide gap that has existed between the student of the humanities and the average layman must be decreased if the latter is not only to understand Hellenism but also to apply actively the benefits of its teachings to modern living.

In this book Professor Agard addresses himself to the people of the United States, realizing that American leadership in the Western world must be based not solely on power and the increasing reliance upon the achievements of scientific materialism, but also on an understanding and appreciation of the cultural traditions of the world. Specifically, the author brings out in his foreword, "Why the Greek Mind?" (pp. 9-14), the timelessness and timeliness of Greek thought, its never-ending relevance to twentieth-century man who even today "may find in the comradeship of Greek minds and the achievements of Greek culture some understanding, comfort, and, perhaps, inspiration" (p. 13). With such a purpose in mind he divides the book into two parts, *The Greek Mind* (pp. 9-86) which contains the interpretative discussion and *Selected Readings from Greek Books* (pp. 89-183) giving the author's own translations (with one exception) in a "contemporary idiom" that document the chapters in the first section. The manner in which Professor Agard approaches his subject throughout is characterized by a calmness of thought and a simplicity of prose not unlike that found in the Greek tradition itself.

Following the historical method, the author concerns himself in the first part with a concise analysis of the Greek mind and its development as found in the archaic,

classical, and Hellenistic periods. Thus, in the section covering the archaic period, he pictures the Greeks as "Pioneers" (pp. 15-30), and in integrated and well-organized chapters—"The Setting," "Man, Nature, and God," "Heroic Virtues," and "Individual Values"—he shows Greek mind and thought in its early aspects. In discussing the classical period, which is termed "The Great Age" (pp. 31-39), the author shows the reasons for the greatness of Greek civilization during the years from 500 to 340 B.C., and in his appraisal of the scale of values of this era, he shows the profundity and depth of the Greek mind as exemplified by its condemnation of *hubris* and its admiration and espousal of *so-phrosúne*. Finally, in the section concerning the Hellenistic age, entitled "The Dispersion" (pp. 70-86), Professor Agard depicts vividly the disintegration and collapse of Greek civilization and thought. He shows this in ominous terms that Americans of today cannot ignore, especially as one considers American history in the period from the cessation of World War II to the present time, when, as he has written, "our present pattern of life is in many ways similar to that of Hellenistic Greece."³ The author asks the perennial question, Why the decline of the Greeks? And his reply, though not an original one, points out the loss of political liberty, over-specialization, dependence on slave labor, military disasters, and moral and political irresponsibility. "Whatever the intricate web of causation," Professor Agard states, "the civilization was tired. Escapism became the order of the day: refuge was sought in one's home, one's profession, social clubs, artistic circles, mystical cults, or in sheer apathy or despair" (p. 86).

The author's translations in the second part are excellent and very readable, and the selections harmonize with the purpose and approach of the first part. To document his earlier discussion of the "Pioneers," he chooses discreetly and includes translations (pp. 89-108) from figures like Hesiod, Homer, and Sappho. "The Great Age" is represented in translations (pp. 109-57) taken from Plato, Aristotle, Thucydides (the translation of Pericles' Funeral Speech is especially graceful), Aristophanes, Sophocles, and Euripides. The readings selected to document "The Dispersion" (pp. 158-83) include selections from Epictetus, Epicurus, Demosthenes, and Theophrastus. The book ends with a fairly good but brief bibliography (pp. 185-86) and an index (pp. 187-90). The bibliography refers one to both primary and secondary sources that deal with Greek authors, history, and

The Third New England **LATIN WORKSHOP**

June 30-July 18

in cooperation with the
Classical Association of New England
and conducted by
John K. Colby, Latin Master,
Phillips Andover Academy

GUEST LECTURERS — EXHIBITS
MUSEUM TRIPS
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES
SUMMER THEATER

For complete information write:

Professor Van L. Johnson
Edward E. Cohen Fine Arts Center

TUFTS UNIVERSITY
Medford, Massachusetts

Suburban Campus in Historic
Metropolitan Boston

institutions. Surprising is the author's omission of the names of Edith Hamilton (*The Greek Way* and *The Echo of Greece*), H. D. F. Kitto (*The Greeks*), and Herbert Muller (*The Uses of the Past*, primarily the chapter on "The Romantic Glory of Classical Greece"), whose works for general readers are certainly more appropriate as a beginning than the more difficult volumes of Werner Jaeger and E. R. Dodds which are noted here.

Although this little volume has very few faults, there is one matter that requires some elaboration, not so much from the point of view of criticism as of clarification. In speaking of the Greek emphasis on moderation, Professor Agard writes: "Boundary" was also a favorite word; Greeks generally preferred to limit situations and ideas to those which could adequately be comprehended by their intelligence; they disliked vagueness, uncertainty, and mysticism" (p. 11). This, of course, is an over-simplification of an important phase of the Greek mind. There is no doubt that Greek thought was rational and objective and that it did not go to extremes. However, to say that the Greeks "disliked vagueness, uncertainty, and mys-

ticism," is inaccurate and even misrepresents the Greek mind. It is an observation, perhaps, that does appeal to the Western mind, with its stress on rational proofs and solutions and its suspicion of metaphysics and metaphysical experience.

Now, if Professor Agard wishes here to give the impression that Greek thought did not succumb to the extremes of Oriental mysticism, or that Hellenic mysticism was speculative as opposed to simple, implicit, unreflective mysticism, he is quite correct. If, on the other hand, he wants the reader to look on Greek thought as naked of mystical aspirations, he is wrong. The fact remains that the Greeks were a metaphysic-loving people, that the Greek mind often transcended rational and objective levels of thought and experience. Who can deny, moreover, that Greek metaphysical thought left its impress upon Christianity in the tendency to define, to speculate, and to intellectualize. The Greek propensity to "mysticism," in fact, is one of the major reasons that theologians like Edwin Hatch and Adolf Harnack attacked the Hellenic role in Christianity as corruptive and adulterative. Hatch, condemning the influences of Christian Hellenism, claimed that Christianity's "darkest pages are those which record the story of its endeavoring to force its transformed Greek metaphysics upon men or upon races to whom they were alien."⁴ In the same vein, and with far-reaching influence, Harnack indicted Hellenism as "a glittering web of allegorical interpretation," transforming the Christian religion "from a worship of God in spirit and in truth into a worship of God in signs, formulas, and idols."⁵

Undoubtedly, the Hellenic trinity of *poie-tés*, *politikós*, *sophós* brings out clearly the realization, as Professor Jaeger has said, that "Other nations made gods, kings, spir-

its: the Greeks alone made men."⁶ But the traditional importance given to the social-political aspect of Greek life is no reason to negate or even limit the metaphysical curiosity and mystical tendency of the Greek mind. The Greeks (e.g., Heraclitus, Anaxagoras, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle) had an intense yearning for the ultimate reality and the ultimate sanction behind all human activity; they found perfect happiness—even as Aristotle did—in contemplation, which was superior to pleasure and statesmanship; and they searched metaphysically for the incorporeal Truth. Thus, Plato, whom Clement of Alexandria called *theophorómenos*, striving to attain a knowledge which will reveal "something of that essence which is eternal, and is not wandering between the two poles of generation and decay,"⁷ longed for the *lógos* which St. John made known. In respect to the role of mysticism in Greek life, Evelyn Underhill observes quite accurately that "Greece taught first the innately mystical, and afterwards the Christian soul, how to understand itself; produced the commentary, but not the text."⁸ The late Dean Inge, also a competent authority in this field, observes: "Platonism supplied the foundations of dogmatic theology, and the whole intellectual framework of Christian mysticism."⁹

Outside of this misconception, Professor Agard is correct in speaking of the importance of the word "boundary" in Greek thought and endeavor. It is a word that somehow or other has been neglected in the present century. The Greek mind was an active and adventurous one. It was able to function properly and creatively only under tolerant conditions, in a setting where fanaticism and dogmatism and conformity were non-existent. It failed only when individual initiative and responsibility yielded to political, religious, and emotional authority. When the Greeks began to distrust the intellect to suppress unpopular ideas, and to threaten the open market for ideas, they became hopeless victims of their own irrationalism. To the reader, consequently, Professor Agard's book will convey a message of great significance: when values are transvalued, when one's critical faculty becomes inhibited, when political responsibility wanes, when respect for human worth and dignity disappears, life becomes meaningless, and anarchy of thought becomes the dark prison of man's mind.¹⁰

The Greek Mind reveals the mind not only of the Greeks but also of Walter R. Agard, whose devotion to the ideals of freedom is exemplary. We can say of him, as

EXPERIENCED CLASSICIST

Ph.D. contrib. 'Latinitas' & other period., Latn & Greek lang., lit., civiliz. at all levels, presently w. large Univ. (highest recomm.) seeks pos. as Assoc. or Asst. Professor, pref. east. seaboard.

WRITE

Box 101, CLASSICAL JOURNAL
Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.

did the citation when he was awarded an L.H.D. by Amherst College in 1955: "What Pericles said of his compatriots might well be applied to you—'You love beauty without extravagance and wisdom without weakness of will.'"

GEORGE A. PANICHAS

Holy Cross
Orthodox Theological School,
Brookline, Massachusetts

NOTES

¹ "The Rainbow Bridge," *Atlantic Monthly*, November, 1957, p. 178.

² *The Virginia Quarterly Review* 32 (1956) 172.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

⁴ *The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity* (New York, 1957) p. 349. Dr. Hatch's monumental work was originally published posthumously in 1890 under the title *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*. See Glanville Downey's review of this book, reissued as a Harper Torchbook (No. 18), in *CJ* 53 (1957) 40-41. For those who may wish to read a more exhaustive and critical analysis of Dr. Hatch's volume, see W. Sanday's "Greek Influence and Christianity," *Contemporary Review*, May, 1891, pp. 678-90. Though Rev. Sanday's article, which is typical of the best in English scholarship, was written for an older generation, it is still pertinent and provides some excellent corrective insight into the thinking of Dr. Hatch.

⁵ *What is Christianity?* trans. T. B. Saunders (New York, 1901) p. 238.

⁶ *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, trans. Gilbert Highet, 2nd. ed. (New York, 1945) vol. 1, p. xxii.

⁷ Rep. 6. 485b.

⁸ *The Mystic Way* (New York, 1913) p. 39.

⁹ "A New Reformation," *Hibbert Journal* 41 (1943) 203-204. A valuable work that deals with this subject is Dean Inge's well-known book *Christian Mysticism*, 8th ed. (London, 1948), especially the excellent section, "Christian Platonism and Speculative Mysticism," pp. 77-164. See also Rufus M. Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion* (London, 1909) pp. 57-79.

¹⁰ For the ideas expressed in this paragraph, the reviewer is indebted to Professor Agard's article, "The Holy Curiosity of Inquiry."

The Story of Camilla (from *Aeneid*, Books VII and XI). Edited by BERTHA TILLY. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (*Cambridge Elementary Classics*), 1956. Pp. xix, 136. 8 plates. \$1.00.

THE EDITOR OF THIS attractive little text is convinced—and with good reason, I believe—that students at the high-school level can appreciate Latin poetry. She realizes, moreover, that for full appreciation the subject matter should be interesting. There are very few who would not agree that the story of Camilla in the *Aeneid* (11. 532-end)

presents an interesting subject matter. But Miss Tilly has added to the drama of this episode by selecting with care other passages from Vergil's epic which portray a logical succession of events leading to Camilla's stand and subsequent death in battle. The editor has chosen to begin with the circumstances surrounding the declaration of this war between the Latins and Trojans (7. 601-40)—a fair starting point, it seems to me—and includes the poet's invocation to the Muses which follows immediately (641-46), thereby preserving for the reader a remarkable feature of the epic formula.

When she turns to *Aeneid* 11, Miss Tilly does well to include the rhetorical altercation between Drances and Turnus (336-444), for it is a powerful passage in which two strongly antithetical characters come to verbal grips in a dramatic and suspenseful prelude to the battle which will prove fateful for Camilla.

The notes on the text, which are both numerous and full, are designed primarily to meet the needs of the student who is approaching Vergil's poetry for the first time. The editor often simplifies word order—a task, incidentally, that many elementary texts fail to perform—and offers succinct explanations of difficult passages, using elementary grammatical terms with which the student should be familiar. The notes are also liberally interlarded with her cogent observations on Vergil's poetic technique, her purpose being to show "... where the student may linger over sense and sound, over colour, over the deeper significance of words, over poignant dramatic moments in the story, and may follow the unfolding of an epic tragedy as full of pathos as any ever put upon the stage." Besides these elementary notes, there is a section for advanced students and teachers which comprises more detailed analyses of difficulties raised by the text, as well as discussions of an antiquarian and historical nature.

The photographs which precede the text proper are both useful and interesting because the editor has chosen each with a specific passage of her text in mind. The reproduction of Pheidias' Amazon is especially helpful for anyone endeavoring to visualize Vergil's Camilla.

Errors in printing seem to be almost nonexistent, "Perthesilea" (p. 70, n. on 661 f.) should, of course, be Pentheselea. Also, there is an entry in the Vocabulary that is confusing (p. 134, col. 1). So far as I can make out, there is no Latin hero Turmis. The second-declension genitive assigned to

it suggests to me that it is a garbled duplication of *Turnus* which follows next in the list.

This little book represents, I should say, a successful attempt to edit for high-school use a highly entertaining episode from the *Aeneid*. It is to be hoped that its three companion texts which are now in preparation—the stories of Pallas, Dido, and Troy—will prove as welcome additions to the *Elementary Classics*.

EDWIN S. RAMAGE

Indiana University

The Law and Legal Theory of the Greeks.
By J. WALTER JONES. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1956. Pp. x, 327. \$6.75.

THE TITLE OF THIS BOOK is somewhat misleading, and the subscript "An Introduction" does not delimit it accurately. A reader who expects to find here a relatively complete discussion of ancient Greek law and the machinery of its administration will be gravely disappointed. But the illustrious author, Provost of the Queen's College, Oxford, has a clearly defined idea of his problem, which he states as follows (Preface, p. v): "But its [i.e., the book's] aim is not so much to offer a systematic account of the law current among the Greeks as rather to sketch their legal ideas, whether in or about the law, as an aspect of their thought about life in the city."

The contents of the book are as follows: I. The Function of Law (1-23); II. Dike, Themis, Nomos (24-36); III. Law and Nature (37-72); IV. Eunomia, Homonoia, Isonomia (73-92); V. The Sacred Law (93-101); VI. The Ancestral Laws and their Protection (102-15); VII. Law in the Courts (116-51); VIII. Greek Associations (152-73); IX. Marriage (174-88); X. Kinship and Succession (189-97); XI. Ownership and Possession (198-215); XII. Contract (216-34); XIII. Mortgages and Leases (235-47); XIV. The Mental Element in Wrongdoing (248-76); XV. Position of Slaves, Women, Minors (277-91); XVI. Legal Technique (292-308); XVII. Greek Law and the Barbarians (309-16). There follow an index of Greek words (317-19) and a general index (320-27).

Except for a few minor points, there is little to criticize in this book. I am annoyed by the frequent employment of sqq. in the footnotes. Why not consistently give the concluding line, section or page? It is inaccurate to speak of "Greek lawyers" (p. 215), when dealing with Athens of the fourth

century before Christ. Page 144 contains only one Greek word, but that word lacks its accent. *Arra* is italicized, as it should be, in the index (p. 326), but not in the text (p. 230). Page 237 contains two typographical errors in spacing in the words "possession" and "happened." These minor matters, of course, do not impair the value of the book. Provost Jones is extremely well read in the scholarly literature of today and in the ancient sources. This book deserves a place on the same shelf with the monumental works of Lipsius and Bonner and Smith.

ALFRED P. DORJAHN

Northwestern University

Latin Poetry in Verse Translation. Edited by L. R. LIND. Cambridge (Mass.): Riverside editions C 20, 1957. Pp. xxxix, 438.

AS A KIND OF COUNTERPART to his anthology of Greek drama (reviewed in the March issue), Mr. Lind has undertaken to compile an anthology of Latin poetry "from the beginnings to the Renaissance." Regardless of particularities in taste, one must applaud the rich scope of his choice. It is not easy to find, even in scattered volumes, translations by contemporary hands of *Furius Bibaculus*, *Publius Syrus*, *Aulus Gellius*, *Angelo Poliziano*, and *George Herbert*. Here the reader finds such minor figures dotting a copious selection of the major standard poets, including pieces from the plays of *Plautus* and *Terence* and from the longer poems of *Lucretius* and *Virgil*.

Mr. Lind lists two principles "beyond the subjective enthusiasm or prejudices with which all anthologists are equipped" as guides in his selection. One was a desire to choose translations which were good English poems, many of which "were made by the poets and literarily sensitive scholars of the present day." The second was a desire to print as many translations as he could which "provided an unusually good refitting of the original meters to the English language." The resulting contrast of meters at first jars; but on reconsideration one sees that a sensitive reader, even without Latin, could begin to taste the special effects of quantitative verse. Occasionally, as in *Horace* 1.25, Mr. Lind prints more than one translation, in different meters. Here there is an excellent opportunity for analysis and evaluation, especially if the anthology is used as a text with a classically trained teacher to point the dis-

cussion. Exact duplication of quantitative meters in English is something of a stunt; but accentual duplication, such as one finds in original poems by Don Marquis or in Rolfe Humphries' translation of Ovid's *Art of Love* (reviewed in *CJ* November, 1957), has a place in English verse.

Mr. Lind's Introduction seems to me more opinionative and less factual than the Introduction to his anthology of Greek drama. Where he was provocative there, he is here often obscure or questionable. There is a persistent effort made to relate Latin poetry to modern poetry, with some dubious conclusions, such as that on p. xxvii where Mr. Lind tries to mark a similarity of technique between T. S. Eliot and Virgil. So, too, his opening historical analysis of an affinity between Latin and contemporary poets seems sketchy and stretched.

The selection from the classic Roman poets is generous and just; and, in the case of Propertius, Mr. Lind rightfully boasts "that the first readable verse translations of Propertius are printed here." They are by Frances Fletcher. He does not strictly confine himself to modern translations; for example, he prints Marlowe's very uneven and often inaccurate translation of Ovid's *Amores*, Andrew Marvell's version of Seneca's *Thyestes* (391-403), Alfred the Great's version of the opening poem of Boethius, and a bit of Sannazaro translated by Richard Lovelace. But his staple translators are people like Gilbert Highet, F. A. Wright, Jack Lindsay, and Rolfe Humphries. The reader will, however, also be pleased to find translations from George Santayana (Tibullus), Gerard Manley Hopkins (Horace), Elinor Wylie (Hadrian), and he will be amused by the presence of Lucius Beebe (Horace). But if Mr. Lind was going to include versions taken from the *Conning Tower*, why did he not include some from F. P. A. himself—surely the most felicitous translator of Horace's humorous verse in English—or from Adams' master, Eugene Field?

The selection from the Renaissance is necessarily more limited; but it is also unduly eclectic and narrow. To include Beccadelli and leave out Mantuan is indeed a surprise. And if Andrea Navagero could be included, why not a selection from Petrarca's *Africa*? The British writers of Latin poetry contribute only two representatives to Mr. Lind's anthology: George Herbert and Richard Crashaw. This leaves out George Buchanan, John Milton, Abraham Cowley—whom Johnson thought superior to Milton—and Thomas May, whom

Johnson thought superior to both. We must, however, be grateful for what we have, for it is ever so much more than what we had, in accessible form, before Mr. Lind's eight years of labor.

Each poet receives a brief comment in the body of the text; the notes are generally either too broad or too narrow, but they do list the text which was used, and this will save many quibbling debates. There is a bibliography which seems more suited to the general reader than that appended to the anthology of Greek drama; and Mr. Lind has provided two useful indices, one to poets and sources, the other to translators. The format is the same as that of the drama anthology.

JOHN CROSSETT

Boston University

The Greek and Macedonian Art of War.
By F. E. Adcock. (Sather Classical Lectures, Vol. 30). Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1957. Pp. vi, 109. \$3.00.

THIS SLENDER, attractive, well-printed volume is a survey in lecture form of the military practices of the Greeks. There are six lectures following a general chronological pattern: warfare in the average Greek city-state; infantry; navies; cavalry, elephants, and siegecraft; strategy; and tactics. An appendix presents the author's opinions regarding the military understanding of the various ancient writers who deal with military matters.

The reader is led from the early Greek period with its emphasis on hoplite citizen-soldiers to the Hellenistic age with its phalanx made up of highly-trained, skillfully and deliberately maneuvering professionals. One is shown the change from the early tactics emphasizing pressure all along the line to the battlefield innovations of Epaminondas, who first threw overwhelming concentrations of troops into a critical point on the line. Along with these basic changes, Adcock discusses such important developments as the use of cavalry, light-armed specialists, and new siege weapons; he mentions the growing realization of the importance in strategy and tactics of position and movement. Some of the more important differences between ancient and modern armies are pointed out: the ancients had poor communications, used fewer reserves, were far less mobile, and therefore could not use tactics which depend on these advantages. The ancients did use what is today called a "fifth column."

The book will be chiefly valuable as a (generally) readable synthesis for the reader or teacher who has not the time or inclination to read the scholarly literature in this field. There is little that is new except for a few fresh viewpoints. There is an occasional amusing flash of insight: "It is true that the use of mercenaries and their leaders tended to slow down the tempo of Greek warfare, for they were not inclined to seek decision by battle, for fear peace might break out" (p. 24). Still, Adcock credits mercenaries with emphasizing the specialization of troops and with originating many of the new methods which characterized the Hellenistic period.

In the lecture on naval warfare, the author (p. 31), discussing the major warship of Greek times, the trireme, allies himself with those who hold that the oars in such a vessel were "arranged in groups of three as in the Venetian galleys of the Middle Ages." His references (note 6) do not include one of the most important: Chester G. Starr's "The Ancient Warship," *CP* 35 (1940) 353-74. Starr deduces the most logical possibility for the arrangement of oars in the trireme consonant with the ancient literary sources (or so it seems to the reviewer). His suggestion is that "... in a trireme

... the rowers sat in groups of three, the innermost or thranite also being the farthest aft and slightly higher than the zygite, the outermost or thalamite being slightly lower than the zygite and farthest forward" (p. 354).

Adcock does not discuss at length the question of the relative merits of the Roman legion and Macedonian-Greek phalanx; however, he remarks, "It was, indeed, the good fortune of Rome that she did not have to match her generals against Alexander and his Successors. And it is not to be forgotten that in her conflicts with Macedon and Seleucid Syria, Rome was assisted by Greek troops under Greek commanders" (p. 96). He reminds one that in the battle of Magnesia, the Romans actually fought an "Alexander battle," with Eumenes and his cavalry playing a decisive role. Still, Adcock admits that "the future development of war and the military art and practice was to owe far more to the Roman tradition than to the Greek or Macedonian" (p. 97).

This book will be useful to the general reader who wants to survey the military science and tactics of the ancient Greeks in an evening's reading.

HENRY C. BOREN

Southern Illinois University

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL is published eight times a year, from October through May.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

The general price is \$3.75 (U.S.A.), \$4.00 (foreign). Single copies 60c (U.S.A.), 65c (foreign); subscriptions for less than a year at the single-copy rate. Subscriptions may be taken through one of the regional associations listed below, annual membership-subscription rate, \$3.75. Members may receive also the CLASSICAL OUTLOOK and CLASSICAL WORLD; for rates consult the regional secretary-treasurer. Members of CAMWS and CAAS have the option of taking either the CLASSICAL JOURNAL or CLASSICAL WORLD.

MEMBERSHIPS

Address the secretary-treasurer of the appropriate regional association. CAMWS, JOHN N. HOUGH, 8E Hellems Bldg., University of Colorado, Boulder. CANE, CLAUDE W. BARLOW, Clark University, Worcester, Mass. CAAS, F. GORDON STOCKIN, Houghton College, Houghton, N.Y. CAPS (Northern), MISS GAIL INGLE, 4754 16th St. N.E., Seattle, Wash.; (Central), EDWARD Y. LINDSAY, Grant Union H.S., Del Paso Heights, Cal.; (Southern), MRS. FRANCES T. CHAMPION, Chadwick School, Rolling Hills, Cal.

CORRESPONDENCE

All general editorial correspondence, MSS, etc. to NORMAN T. PRATT, JR., Department of Classics, Indiana University, Bloomington. Departmental material to the proper editors. MSS from the Atlantic, New England, and Pacific states to these regional editors. Concerning subscriptions and details of circulation to PROFESSOR HOUGH (address above). On advertising and other business items to D. HERBERT ABEL, Loyola University, 820 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago, Ill.

Table 1. The effect of the presence of a 100% and 50% of the maximum acceptable weight (MAW) on the number of correct responses (CR) and the number of incorrect responses (IR) for the 100% and 50% MAW conditions

Condition	CR	IR
100% MAW	10	10
50% MAW	10	10

Table 2. The effect of the presence of a 100% and 50% of the maximum acceptable weight (MAW) on the number of correct responses (CR) and the number of incorrect responses (IR) for the 100% and 50% MAW conditions

Condition	CR	IR
100% MAW	10	10
50% MAW	10	10

Table 3. The effect of the presence of a 100% and 50% of the maximum acceptable weight (MAW) on the number of correct responses (CR) and the number of incorrect responses (IR) for the 100% and 50% MAW conditions

Condition	CR	IR
100% MAW	10	10
50% MAW	10	10

Table 4. The effect of the presence of a 100% and 50% of the maximum acceptable weight (MAW) on the number of correct responses (CR) and the number of incorrect responses (IR) for the 100% and 50% MAW conditions

Condition	CR	IR
100% MAW	10	10
50% MAW	10	10

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL